

## AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

|  |                                 |             |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION   | <b>PRESENTED:</b> June 18, 2008 |             |
| TITLE: 2202-2224 South Park Street - Master Plan Update/Revision, Planned Commercial Site in Urban Design District No. 7. Ald. Dist. 14. | <b>REFERRED:</b>                |             |
|  | <b>REREFERRED:</b>              |             |
|  | <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>           |             |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary  | <b>ADOPTED:</b>                 | <b>POF:</b> |
| DATED: June 18, 2008   | <b>ID NUMBER:</b>               |             |

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of June 18, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on the Master Plan update/revision for a Planned Commercial Site, the “Villager Mall” located at 2202-2224 South Park Street. Olinger provided an overview of details for the “Program Statement for the Villager” prepared by Strang, Inc. in December 2007 for the Community Development Authority of the City of Madison. It provides the basis for recommended modifications to the previously approved “Site Development and Master Plan” for the Villager adopted in October 2005. Olinger reviewed the previous recommendations within the Villager Master Plan for redevelopment of the site involving the eventual elimination and demolition of the existing Villager Mall facility following the phased redevelopment of the site with new buildings on the streetscape along the property’s Park Street frontage with both surface and structured parking. Olinger noted that the recommendations of the Strang report does provide for the preservation of the “atrium” portion of the existing mall with options to preserve, maintain or demolish either the south and north building extensions dependent on future programming for existing service agencies occupying these areas, combined with the development of future retail, library and health outpad sites, including the potential for the development of facilities for the Urban League on one of the potential outpad sites. Olinger explained the most significant departure from the recommendations of the master plan which provides for the preservation of the atrium section of the building was necessitated as a need to support the core group of the atrium’s tenants who now desire to remain in the existing facility on the site. The core group’s tenants provide the basis for the necessary economic returns to satisfy the CDA’s debt service requirements at the same time allowing future development. The core group of tenants include Madison Area Technical College and the University of Wisconsin, which has a range of various functions within the atrium that include UW Space Place and the UW Law Project. Other tenancies also include the Madison Urban Ministry, the City of Madison Information Technology Center, South Metro Planning Council and various Dane County facilities. Olinger explained the immediate need to support an amendment to the original master plan to allow the updating and improvements to the central atrium core as a departure from its demolition within its original provisions. Olinger elaborated on the potential for the development of an Urban League office along the property’s Park Street frontage, in conjunction with the development of the two northerly outpad sites. Olinger remarked on additional departures from the original master plan that would provide for either the demolition of either the south building extension or north building extension, in conjunction with the development of a healthcare facility on the northeasterly corner of the site abutting the property’s Park Street frontage. Future planning and budgeting for those agencies

located within the existing structures would determine which building extension would be maintained or demolished. The affected agencies include the Access to Community Health Center, the Harambee Center, the South Madison Public Library, Planned Parenthood, the Parent Council-Head Start, the Public Health Department-Madison and Dane County, the Urban League, Wingra Clinic and the Head Start Program.

Following Olinger's presentation discussion with the Commission noted the following:

- Need to provide qualifiers and actual parking demand.
- Not addressing the street as with original plan.
- Need to get a better sense of shared parking and parking shifts.
- Try to introduce a large building, L-shaped along the south side of the relocated driveway entry to develop some sort of court between the library building to the north.
- Try to incorporate doors to the street with buildings that are up on the street.
- Look at relocating northerly driveway entry between the library and health pad sites more central with alternative driveway provided further south to create a loop for drop-off and access.
- Better way to organize front parking on site to be less dominant; consider relocating to the northwest.
- Draw massing to the street to frame the existing building, not parking.
- Good job pulling out front of the building which is made more coherent with improvements, but move end spaces to the street.
- Look at creating parking efficiencies with adjoining properties to create more parking behind buildings.
- The original master plan addresses many of the issues with the mall where the new plan doesn't.
- Not a minor tweak; throws out the master plan, headed in a different direction.
- Original plan provides for street presence, walkability, a new Villager Mall. The new one doesn't.
- If the atrium is kept with outpads as proposed and the remainder demolished, where does plan go, need to see details.

Following the discussion Olinger noted the need to provide for the immediate improvements to the atrium and accommodate existing users in order to proceed with planning for the remainder of the site. The Commission noted the need to deal with master planning overall issues in order to proceed.

### **ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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 3, 4, 4, 4.5 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2202-2224 South Park Street**

|                       | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>Member Ratings</b> | 3         | -            | 3              | -                              | -     | 3                                   | 3             | 3              |
|                       | 5         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | 7                                   | 5             | -              |
|                       | 4.5       | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | 4             | 4.5            |
|                       | 5         | -            | 5              | -                              | -     | 5                                   | 5.5           | -              |
|                       | 6         | 8            | 7              | 7                              | -     | 6                                   | 6             | 6              |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | -             | 4              |
|                       | 4         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | 6                                   | 4             | 4              |
|                       | 5         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | -             | -              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |

**General Comments:**

- It seems that the City has lowered its goals to the extent it wants to enhance the quality and use of the site. Keeping the existing massing works against the City.
- Good job tying Atrium façades together, but overall site plan wants to draw more to Park Street. Keeping Atrium would be acceptable, but keeping north and south wings fundamentally kills the vision for a “new Villager.” Repeated master planning exercises (initial 2005) shortsighted. Economic feasibility analysis calls into question City’s ability to do real estate development.
- Unfortunately, this is not master planning; it is piecemeal planning and, demonstrably, of less quality than the previous plan. Let’s do better.
- Laudable project to keep social services, education and expand healthcare facilities. Work at making this urban destination more active to Park Street. Find a way to incorporate rehab of Atrium and move buildings on the street. Plan to eliminate one/both of wings. Address corner of Park and Hughes, 6,000 square foot building under whelming.
- Like aspects of former and current proposals.
- Both for the Commission and for the potential new tenants, it would be helpful to have a longer-term plan for this site. As it is now, the Phase One changes would be good, but without a larger plan for the way the site will work it’s difficult to endorse even this first, positive step forward.
- Parking lot is too prominent, especially relative to the site’s gateway presence.
- New changes need to be explored further. Development needs to be quality, yet affordable. Keeping entire big box block building does not work.