

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: September 7, 2016

TITLE: 1004 & 1032 South Park Street – Three Buildings of 3-5 Stories Containing Residential with First Floor Commercial and a Landscaped Courtyard in UDD No. 7. 13th Ald. Dist. (43556)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: September 7, 2016

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 7, 2016, the Urban Design Commission RECEIEVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION for three buildings of 3-5 stories containing residential with first floor commercial and a landscaped courtyard in UDD No. 7 located at 1004 & 1032 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Matt Honold and Jon Hepner, representing T. Wall Properties.

One level of parking (157 stalls) is now buried underground with the entrance off Fish Hatchery Road, putting the first floor residences approximately at grade. The five live-work units have been lowered to be at the same level as the plaza (2-3 feet above grade). The commercial spaces are at grade at the intersection. All along Fish Hatchery Road are walk-up residential units. The building materials remain the same.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The comments from Ron Shutvet are relevant, and discuss many of the same issues and concerns that Planning staff has.
- What’s the impact on South Street? That’s a small street. You also have the medical unit using that street, now you’re going to use it for trash, have you looked at the traffic impacts?
 - With reducing the inlet off of South Park Street, and really dedicating the inlet off of Fish Hatchery is actually reducing the amount of traffic.
 - We did meet with Eric Halverson to go over the revised scope. He was comfortable with the revised plans and we also revised our traffic impact analysis from our previous plans and that did bring up any sort of complications.
- If this is accurate the bike parking has been slashed quite a bit.
- In terms of quantity, I’m wondering if it’s too low in elevation. How are people going to get down there safely and actually use it, without feeling like bike versus vehicle.
 - We do have three elevators that go down to the parking. The pitch is about 12%.

If you're proposing it on this lower level you really need to make it easy, otherwise you need to get it up by the front door where people actually use it.

The main lobby will be off Fish Hatchery Road and there will be direct access to the elevators from that lobby.

- Most bikers don't use those elevators.
- What about bikes coming to the commercial space, where are they going to park?
- This is really important to Park Street. You've taken more commercial away, and I have to agree with Ron's comments about activity on Park Street and Fish Hatchery both. It's too close, you don't have much breathing space for anything. If we want to create Park Street with street trees and bring that back, this is going to make it very difficult because it's built so close.
 - The street trees are all remaining the same as what was originally approved.
- I've got to hear the City say that, I've seen that happen and the City says "we have no room to put in those trees now."
- Park Street sidewalks are so narrow anyway, so when you build up as close as you can there's no breathing room. If someone comes down with a mega-stroller, they're in the street. I would like to see it pushed back a little bit.
- As you know when the original GDP was approved for this overall site, including the clinic, it superseded the requirements of the Park Street Urban Design District, which is based on the Park Street Urban Design Guidelines, which prescribed for a certain amount of retail/commercial at the street, to engage the street, as well as storefronts and not necessarily residences. That adjustment was allowed because we had a product like this that was deemed an acceptable level of retail/commercial versus residential. This is even more of a throwback away from that. Going back and looking at what was prescribed under various plans, and what's being prescribed now is very valid because you're not honoring what we approved before.
- It's a very different project that what we started with.
- They don't look like they're reducing that much commercial in terms of street frontage though, maybe 20-feet.
- It was already pretty minimal and now they're just making it worse.
- One of the questions about live-work units is do they really work as more than just residential? If you had some real demonstration that the live-work really engaged the street in different ways than just a residential unit, but I'm not sure they do.
- They didn't at Middleton Hills.
- At least they provide some relief along the sidewalk, maybe they could provide even more.
- My biggest concern is this traffic flow. This is really tough and it's an accident waiting to happen. It needs to be wider or pushed back off of South Street. Those maneuvers are going to be really tough, and with snow and such, I see a lot of accidents.
- There were large planting beds on both sides of the street that were part of the building architecture, not just pots sitting there. These look like add-ons.
- I think that should be honored if that's what was approved.
- There is not enough commercial space to sustain this as a public first floor interactive space. The live-work units, there was a lot of conversation about how those would be accessible from the street.
- Somehow you need to research and convince us that those address the street, if you're going to be replacing the commercial.

ACTION:

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