

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: February 8, 2017

TITLE: 1202 South Park Street – Four-Story, 58-Unit Permanent Supportive Housing Development in UDD No. 7. 13th Ald. Dist. (45917)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: February 8, 2017

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Tom DeChant, Rafeeq Asad, Cliff Goodhart, Michael Rosenblum and Sheri Carter.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 8, 2017, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a four-story, 58-unit permanent supportive housing development in UDD No. 7 located at 1202 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Pam Mellblom, representing MSR Design; and James Lewis, representing Heartland Housing. This is the third phase of the City’s initiative to provide permanent supportive housing. The building regards all setbacks as required and maintains a consistent street-front façade. On the back of the building, there is access to underground parking and a landscaped open space. On the bottom SW corner of the site, there will be a trash and recycling enclosure. The basement will include storage, bike parking, and car parking space. The rear of the building will include dwelling units, a library, and fitness rooms. There will be commercial space, including two conference rooms and a community room, on the front of the building (S Park Street side). From the second floor up, there are living spaces. Most of them are studios; some are one bedrooms. Roofs are accessible and usable/public space for all residents.

There are three options for the building’s design. Each of the three will use a similar materials palate. The first, which complies with the step-back requirement, is an attempt to be more visually interesting and to provide a sense of contiguousness with the rest of the street. There will be large windows, some signage, and brick panel on the base. Option two more exemplifies the texture of the street and is more visually active. Option two violates the step back requirement. The third option would be fully compliant with the step back rule, but the community did not provide positive feedback for it.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The set back rule relates to an ordinance (UDD No. 7). For this project to be approved with buildings that aren’t compliant, the ordinance would need to be changed, which is both time-consuming and unlikely. An ordinance change would apply to all buildings within a district; not just an individual project (staff).
- The streetscape piece also requires revision and a lot of care, as it will set the tone for the block; as required in UDD No. 7.

- The only building that would appear to address UDD No. 7 at this time is the third option.
- Were the neighbors on High Street approached?
 - Yes – a ¼ mile in each direction received notices.
- If any of these residents called a cab, where would the cab stop? Where would residents wait for the cab?
 - There is on-street parking, and the entire setback on Park Street includes sidewalks. There is also a vestibule and a community room in which they could wait.
- Is the city comfortable with the setback?
 - There are some concerns, and there cannot be trees along Park Street.
- You're setting the tone on Park Street, so do think about how you're making the space look. What is on the third option?
 - Fencing.
- Things like that give it a bit of a temporary look. Be careful with that, and think about what it will be like for people to walk up and down Park Street.
- What is the future of High Street? Does that remain a street? With only 8 parking spaces for the building, where will people park?
 - This is being discussed internally along with Olin Avenue. This plan & redevelopment would eliminate the Olin Avenue aspect. It's a discussion that is still in progress. The other piece is that there is another large landholder there (Dean Care) that needs to either be factored in or worked around (Vaughn).
- The smoking area for residents should be very clear/defined and not particularly visible to the neighborhood.
- You have access to a rooftop terrace. Suggesting a rooftop garden/planting opportunity would be a good idea for an amenity.
 - At another property, there is a rooftop terrace. One of the issues on Park Street is that the open space requirement does not count rooftop gardens as open space. They also do not have a partner for this project.
 - Vaughn: this is something that needs clarification from the Zoning Administrator, as this is the first she's hearing of that issue with the requirement.
- I like the rhythm of option three more than the other two. The trellises on the North side of the building don't seem purposeful to me, as they're in shade.
- The brick siding/veneer isn't going to fly.
- At your other projects, there have been over 100 police calls. What is your plan to address that at Park Street?
 - From meetings with property management: some of the calls are from residents about things happening outside the building. That issue has also settled down somewhat in recent history. It's more a question for management than the builders.
- There's only a three year lease left on Pick 'N' Save which will not be renewed. Will the building still be close to a grocery store?
 - There is an Asian grocery store, they use grocery delivery services, and staff will take people to grocery stores.
- Question the use of brick expressed E-fis; use siding rather than fake siding, even if it's not brick.
- With regard to the question of whether or not they should put in sidewalks: that's a question for City Traffic Engineering, not UDC.
- The guardrails look like they're keeping someone from trying to escape; like a cage. What is the purpose of those?
 - They're intended to keep people from jumping off. Ideally, they'd like to have a two foot planter buffer to make it look a little less institutional.

- Look at other architecture/treatments to resolve.
- Work on distinguishing the residential part of the first floor from the commercial portion.

ACTION:

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