

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: June 4, 2008
TITLE: 515 South Midvale Boulevard – PUD-SIP, Phase 2, Sequoya Commons, 100 Apartments and Approximately 10,650 Square Feet of Retail. 11 th Ald. Dist. (10043)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: June 4, 2008	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 4, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD-SIP for Phase 2, Sequoya Commons. Appearing on behalf of the project were Bruce Simonson and John Lichtenheld, representing Midvale, LLC; Joe Krupp and Daniel Kahll. Appearing in opposition to the project were Bonnie McMullin-Lawton, Pamela Mather, Anna Strenski and Miriam Levinson. Appearing neither in support nor opposition were Earl H. Reichel, Chris Schmidt, representing Westmoreland Neighborhood Association Planning and Development Committee, Paul Haskew, and Ald. Tim Gruber, representing the 11th Aldermanic District. Prior to the presentation staff distributed materials from the Planning Division file relevant to the issue of the proposed location of the residential garage entry on Caromar Drive; where the Commission approved its location on Midvale Boulevard during its deliberation on the first phase PUD-SIP and GDP for Phase 2. The relevant condition provided with Plan Commission and subsequent Common Council adoption of the rezoning states the following: “Approval of the residential garage entrance onto Caromar Drive for the Phase 2 building shall be determined at the time the developer requests Specific Implementation Plan approval for that building.” Staff noted that this condition superseded the Commission’s approval of the driveway on the Midvale Boulevard elevation of the building but provides for the continued discussion on the issue, as well as its final resolution as part of the consideration for Phase 2. A detailed review of the site plan elements for Phase 2 as it relates to the previously approved Phase 1 of the project followed, including an overview of the various building elevations, site and landscape plan details, including the following:

- Modifications to the landscape plan in regards to proportionally sized landscape plantings and the screening of windows.
- In regards to the setback issue on the three-story façade abutting Caromar Drive has been adjusted to provide for a 25-foot setback with the shifting of the building closer to its Midvale Boulevard frontage.
- The applicant maintained position that the Caromar Drive entry is much safer than the alternative Midvale Boulevard drive entry.
- A modified plant list was provided that coordinates plants, quantities, species and planting types.
- A request to rotate the stair tower elements due to issues with the massing was responded to with the provisions of vertically oriented window openings on stair tower façades.

- The proposed driveway entry off of Caromar Drive features a median island restricting movement to right turn only.
- Relevant to the stair tower blankness, consideration for adjustment and rotation would disrupts units and interior/exterior plans, but added glazing (double roll) where the developer prefers a single vertical row/column.
- The Commission generally noted its favorability toward the single row of windows.
- Lichtenheld provided more details relevant to the discussion on driveway access issue, Midvale Boulevard versus Caromar Drive. He noted that the residential use of the building with access onto the regular street was compatible. The at grade relationship on Caromar Drive was more accommodating for the slope of the driveway, where the slope on Midvale Boulevard would present difficulties.
- Lichtenheld further remarked that a driveway entrance on Midvale Boulevard would be limited to right-turn only for exiting with a u-turning required after crossing two lanes to go southbound on Midvale Boulevard. In addition, coming from northbound, a u-turn would be required to access the Midvale entry, also crossing two lanes.
- A site distance issue with building drive and landscaping's proximity to Midvale in addition to conflicts with on-street parking.

Following the discussion several neighborhood residents spoke, noting the following:

- A better solution for the driveway is Midvale Boulevard. Phase 2 should be setback 30-feet per the previous revision with the PUD-GDP.
- Emphasize the use of native landscaping.
- Access to parking is a self-inflicted dilemma based on maximum density of the project as proposed. The Caromar exit not a good idea, effects neighbors and adjacent two schools and adjacent apartment building.
- Garage entry needs to be on Midvale Boulevard. Need to limit traffic on Caromar Drive.
- Limited visual access on Caromar Drive where along Midvale there is a 300-foot visual corridor.
- Need a full 30-foot setback on Caromar Drive.
- Need to provide more thought as to traffic as it relates to the residential neighborhood.
- A driveway entry off of Caromar Drive will increase volumes of traffic; Midvale Boulevard more appropriate.

Following testimony from area residents, Ald. Tim Gruber spoke on the following:

- Architecture looks great, especially the appearance and amount of glass.
- Need accessible access next to surface parking entry off of Caromar Drive.
- Additional 5-feet for a 25-foot setback at Caromar Drive is an improvement.
- Issue with Caromar Drive versus Midvale Boulevard driveway entry discussion, no perfect solution, prefer double access from both streets, disperses traffic but removes a rain garden.
- Having access internal to the site at existing surface parking entries a problem for retail tenants.
- Ald. Gruber further noted scheduled meetings with Traffic Engineering to discuss the issue was pending where Traffic Engineering would not take a specific position on the issue.

Continued discussion on the project by the Commission was as follows:

- Still an issue with arborvitae screening windows. Need to identify specific type of low growing landscaping.
- In the courtyard green roof, issue with trees at center, not inviting.

- Move Honey Locust as a feature tree at the entry to the courtyard in place for Kentucky Coffee Tree. Don't object to the arrangement of the trees at the center of the courtyard.
- Question availability of current traffic counts on neighborhood streets, as well as for the development as approved with Phase 1 and as proposed with Phase 2.
- Need to evaluate the value of retail having more value than allowing an entry on Caromar Drive.
- Issue with north crosswalk versus south crosswalk at the intersection of Caromar and Owen Drive, neighborhood prefers the utilization of the areas along Caromar south of the crosswalk to allow for safe use for pedestrians, where north of the crosswalk desire a reduction in traffic impacts, in combination with eliminating the proposed Caromar Drive entry and utilizing the existing access approved with Phase 1 on Caromar Drive to the surface parking area.
- Impact of traffic from the proposed Caromar Drive entry to the northerly crosswalk at the intersection of Caromar Drive and Owen Drive a major concern of neighbors.

ACTION:

On a substitute motion by Wagner, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this project to address the above stated concerns and the following:

- Deal with imprecise numbers in traffic counts. Want to see more updated data to provide a basis for determining on the driveway access issue.
- Need more specific traffic analysis data along with the alternatives to what the City might do versus the developer to make the issue more dealable, including providing a list of alternatives that can be utilized on Caromar Drive and Owen Drive and the general vicinity on what can be done to reduce vehicular traffic impacts in the area.
- Ask Traffic to look at issues. Consider stop signs, a traffic table and other amenities to address concerns.
- Relevant to the vertical provision of a vertical row glazing on the stair towers, one instead of two is acceptable.

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 ratings for this project are 5.8, 6, 6, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 515 South Midvale Boulevard

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	6	-	6	-	5	7	5.8
	6	6	6	-	-	5/6	6	6
	-	8	8	7	-	4	7	-
	-	7	-	-	-	5	-	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	5	8	8	7	-	5	8	7

General Comments:

- Consider reducing retail footprint and putting underground parking entry off internal drive aisle. This would resolve many of the perceived/real conflicts with Caromar. Otherwise get more traffic data and ask Traffic Engineering to help with Owen intersection. Like interior courtyard. 25-foot setback from Caromar is an improvement. Overall still needs work.
- Traffic counts need to be updated and expanded. Solve traffic problem on residential streets.
- Access from Caromar will be a neighborhood issue. Must get acceptance from residents.
- Safe pedestrian crossing at Caromar and Owen is paramount. Need better traffic count data to evaluate garage entrance location.
- Still need to resolve the controversial Caromar vehicle entrance, and applicant needs to proactively work with Alder and Traffic Engineering to meet neighbors' concerns.
- Good project once parking entry is resolved.