

FIRST FLOOR PLAN
 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

A-11
 2.6.11


PROPOSED FACILITY FOR:
WEST MIFLIN STREET
 WEST MIFLIN STREET
 MADISON, WISCONSIN

CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS
 SHALL BE BASED ON THE LATEST EDITION OF THE
 BUILDING CODE OF THE CITY OF MADISON,
 WISCONSIN, AND THE LATEST EDITION OF
 THE INTERNATIONAL BUILDING CODE.

REV DATE


634 West Main Street
 Madison, WI 53703
 608-257-1030
 FAX 608-257-1032






SECOND FLOOR PLAN

<p>A-12 2.6.11</p>	<p>PROPOSED FACILITY FOR WEST MIFFLIN STREET WEST MIFFLIN STREET MADISON, WISCONSIN</p>	<p>CONTRACTING PERMITS CONTRACTING PERMITS CONTRACTING PERMITS CONTRACTING PERMITS CONTRACTING PERMITS</p>	<p>REV DATE</p>	<p>634 West Main Street Madison, WI 53703 608-257-1090 FAX 608-257-1092</p>	
------------------------	--	--	-----------------	--	--



FOURTH FLOOR PLAN
 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



THIRD FLOOR PLAN
 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



PROPOSED FACILITY FOR:
WEST MIFFLIN STREET
 WEST MIFFLIN STREET
 MADISON, WISCONSIN

A-13
 2611

--

CONSTRUCTION PERMITS
 THE STATE OF WISCONSIN
 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS
 MADISON, WISCONSIN

REV DATE

634 West Main Street
 Madison, WI 53703
 608-257-1030
 FAX 608-257-1022



**Mifflin West District, CNI
Comments on the Development Proposal
For 416-420-424 West Mifflin Street
McCaughey Properties, LLC and TJK Design Build Inc.
February 06, 2011**

Summary

This document summarizes the results of steering committee meetings, district meetings, and a general neighborhood meeting regarding the proposed development at 416-424 West Mifflin Street. Mifflin West District representatives worked with the developer over the last six months to help shape the proposal to make it most acceptable to neighborhood residents. The primary concern is that the proposed height and mass is too great for the existing context. This statement does not provide outright support or opposition to the proposal. People have strong feelings about the Mifflin area and those opposed to this proposal are both strongly passionate and vocal in their opposition. However, it should be noted that the sentiment of most members of the Mifflin West Steering Committee, the and the Mifflin West District, and of residents attending the January 24, 2011 neighborhood meeting was in favor of the proposal.

Developer Relationship

The neighborhood would like to commend the developer, Pat McCaughey on how he has worked with the neighborhood association on this proposal. He understands the neighborhood, has other property in the neighborhood, understands the neighborhood association's role in the development process, and has worked with the neighborhood association in the spirit intended. He engaged the neighborhood association at the outset, maintained good communications, and has been open to the concerns of the neighborhood association.

History Of The Development Process

The developer contacted CNI to engage the neighborhood association as soon as he obtained an option to purchase the properties in July 2010. Over the course of the next six months he met with the Mifflin West Steering Committee six times, the Mifflin West District twice, and participated in the general neighborhood meeting. His first meeting with the steering committee was to determine neighborhood desires and concerns. The steering committee provided him with a set of desired architectural features intended to have the proposal fit the context of the Mifflin Street area. These features included gabled roofs, multiple entrances, front porches, setbacks for green space, and offsets to break up the mass. The developer incorporated these features in his initial design presented to the UDC at its September 22, 2010 meeting. The committee's reaction to the architectural style was uniformly unfavorable. Based on UDC feedback and planning staff recommendations, a second design was produced for a four story, flat roof design. The steering committee agreed that the first design was unacceptable and conceded that the gabled roof design element did not scale up to a building of this size. The second design was reviewed by the steering committee. While some strong objections to a 4 story, flat roof design were voiced, the committee decided not to oppose the new design on those grounds. The second design was presented at the December 15, 2010 UDC meeting where it received initial approval.

Areas Of Agreement

- The old Planned Parenthood building needs to be demolished and replaced with quality residential housing.
- The desire for good design and quality materials which reflect and complement the existing neighborhood context.
- The Planned Parenthood building and the house at 424 W Mifflin do not have landmark or historical significance.

Specific Design Concerns

The following areas of concern and interest have been discussed with the developer. The neighborhood association desires to have continued conversations with the developer regarding

the following items throughout the remainder of the development review process and construction phase.

- Provision of a 1:1 bike storage to bedroom ratio.
- Adequate moped parking.
- Adequate visitor bike and moped parking in an area assessable for ease of use.
- Consideration of renewable energy and energy efficient options. However, the consideration of any form of solar energy should take into account how such a system may add to the building height.
- When locating the parking garage exhaust fans, take into consideration the noise they create and how that would impact residents, neighbors, and pedestrians.
- HVAC Units - Consider the impact of noise on neighbors. Consider the impact units would have on the exterior appearance. They should be located to minimize their exposure and vents should be integrated into the exterior design.
- Maximize green space to the extent possible and provide attractive landscaping.
- In considering the disposition of the house at 424 W Mifflin, we encourage the developer to research the viability of moving it or of deconstruction and material salvage.

General Neighborhood Concerns

The following is a list of concerns of how this proposal may affect the neighborhood. These are the views of a minority of participants of the steering committee, Mifflin West District, and general neighborhood meeting. It should be noted that the issue of the affordability of rents was not a concern expressed by the steering committee or the district.

- The structure has too much height and mass for the W. Mifflin St. neighborhood
- The structure is four stories; contrary to all the structures on the 400 and 500 blocks of W. Mifflin St. minus the Ambassador building; the proposed Downtown plan has these two lots designated at three stories
- The set back of the building is not sufficient to support the aesthetic points of W. Mifflin St. neighborhood (i.e. set back adding green space, front porch, etc.)
- The roof may be prepared for the future possibility of solar panels. If ever placed on this roof, it would add to the height and poor aesthetic view of the sky line of the neighborhood
- Flat roof also emphasizes the mass of the building
- Building does not have a front porch like structure mimicking the width and length of porches found along W. Mifflin St.
- Building design does not encourage socializing or friendliness of atmosphere found along W. Mifflin St.
- Balconies are not a replacement for front porches; balconies placed on front and back of building; width supports 1-2 chairs and little space for socializing.
- The developer indicated when first introducing the plan to the W. Mifflin West Neighborhood steering committee, rental units would be directed to young professionals; he is timed to offer leases as of June to capture this demographic. This is contrary to the affordability of housing for students found on W. Mifflin and takes away other possible options that may add affordable housing options.
- This development may push rent costs up; currently students pay a range of \$400-650/month. The developer indicated he would be charging \$1000 – \$1300 dependent on studio, one bedroom, or two bedroom units.
- W. Mifflin on the 400 and 500 blocks have been student housing and significant to the history associated with UW students. The proposed development will push the students closer to the high rise housing and more expensive housing and does not support the culture and history of the area.

February 7, 2011

Dear Planning Commission Members,

This statement is in opposition to the development planned for the current Planned Parenthood and neighboring lot.

I have a strong tie to the University and the culture and history of W. Mifflin St. I also have the opportunity to view W. Mifflin St. neighborhood every day. I love the homes, gabled roofs, front porches and student environment. The aesthetics and its culture are important to the quality of life and the vitality of the downtown.

The following are key areas I object to in the current development as proposed by Pat McCaughey.

- The structure is too dense (too many units in a single building, physical structure/scale too big in comparison to other houses along street, for the W. Mifflin St. neighborhood
- The structure is four stories; contrary to all the structures on the 400 and 500 blocks of W. Mifflin St. minus the Ambassador building; the proposed downtown plan has these two lots designated at three stories. In a building rendering from 11/29/2010, it appears the proposed development's height exceeds the four stories of the Ambassador Building.
- The front set back of the building is not sufficient to support the aesthetic points of W. Mifflin St. neighborhood (i.e. set back adding green space, front porch, etc.) The large portion of the building structure (outer façade) is closer to the sidewalk than the other homes/buildings along W. Mifflin St. The building structure is aligned with the front porches and not the main façade of the houses.
- The design shows a flat roof whereas the majority of structures along the 400 and 500 blocks are house like structures, angled and gabled; the sky line is very interesting and appealing and a flat roof will take away from the area.
- I believe the roof will be prepared for the future possibility of solar panels. If ever placed on this roof, it would add to the height and poor aesthetic view of the sky line of the neighborhood
- Flat roof also emphasizes the mass of the building
- Building does not have a front porch like structure mimicking the width and length of porches found along W. Mifflin St.
- Building design does not encourage socializing or friendliness of atmosphere found along W. Mifflin St.
- Balconies are not a replacement for front porches; balconies placed on front and back of building; width supports 1-2 chairs and little space for socializing.
- The developer indicated when first introducing the plan to the W. Mifflin Neighborhood Development steering committee, rental units would be directed to young professionals; he is timed to offer leases as of June to capture this demographic. This is contrary to the affordability of housing for students found on W. Mifflin and this proposal takes away other possible options that may add affordable housing options.
- This development may push rent costs up; currently students pay a range of \$400-650/month. The developer indicated he would be charging \$1000 – \$1300 dependent on studio, one bedroom, or two bedroom units.
- W. Mifflin on the 400 and 500 blocks has been student housing and significant to the history associated with UW students. The proposed development will push the students closer to the high rise housing and more expensive housing and does not support the culture and history of the area.

Suggested options for this space:

- Development of two to three individual homes similar in design to homes currently on W. Mifflin St.
- City purchase the space for a park
- A housing structure smaller in scale (three stories , greater front set back, and design similar to gabled roofs and front porches of current homes along W. Mifflin St.

I should also, note I have been an active member of the W. Mifflin District Neighborhood and its subcommittee dealing with developments in the neighborhood.

I hope you will take these concerns as a relevant part of your discussion regarding this development.

Sincerely,
Peggy LeMahieu