

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: May 5, 2010
TITLE: 1628 Winnebago Street – PUD(GDP-SIP), Multi-Unit Residential Development. 6 th Ald. Dist. (18289)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: May 5, 2010	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Richard Wagner, John Harrington, Jay Ferm, Ron Luskin and Mark Smith.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 5, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1628 Winnebago Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Ray White, Steve Yoder, representing Apex; and Bruce Bosben. Appearing in opposition to the project were Scott B. Thornton, Lindsey Lee, Anne Walker and Peter Wolff, representing the Marquette Neighborhood Association; Catherine Capellaro, Karolyn Beebe, Leo Rohn-Capellaro, Ed Jepsen, Cheryl Diaby, Karen Matteom, Mike Crawford, Fae Dremock, Julian, Kevin Sonnemann, Peg Smelser, and Margaret Bergamini. Registered neither in support nor opposition was Gary Tipler.

Yoder presented details on "The Riverside at Yahara," at Merry and Winnebago Streets. It encompasses four properties, one of which is a vacant lot, a 22-unit apartment unit property, along with a duplex and single-family lots. The project would relocate an existing building and build a comparable building next to it. Yoder stated they have spent two years working with the neighborhood association. Yoder presented renderings of the various lots on Merry and Winnebago Streets. He stated they wanted the neighborhood association's strong input as to the design of the buildings. He showed a contemporary version of a newly proposed larger building at Winnebago Street, as well as a much more traditional version, which keeps more of the bohemian feel. Ray stated they had originally included two sets of rowhouses but it became too dense from an urban standpoint so they went with a smaller building, minimizing its effect on greenspace by going up vertically. The building at 1628 Winnebago Street would be moved. He stated there is a challenge to design something that will fit in the space while saving greenspace and making the neighborhood happy. Parking was described as being under some townhouses due to the varying grades of the area. He stated they would be pulling traffic off of Merry Street with the new parking amenities. The new parking garage has no exposure to the neighbors or the river with one access point off of Winnebago Street. The plan tries to keep the character of the neighborhood with walk-up porches, greenspace in between, creating more of an edge along Winnebago Street by shielding the site and creating a line between a fairly busy street and the neighborhood. Yoder then presented renderings of other buildings in the neighborhood that are built next to or across from lower story buildings. Stormwater management issues and footprints were discussed as being important as the construction process continues.

Public comment included the following remarks:

- Scott Thornton, President of the Marquette Neighborhood Association spoke of the uniqueness of this neighborhood. He stated the plan brought by Apex was overwhelmingly rejected by the neighborhood over one year ago. Last fall they started meeting again to address issues, but not to much success. The site is environmentally sensitive, the area is prone to flooding, the site itself has historic significance. This project does not meet the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan for low density development. Stormwater abatement, greenspace, respected historic content of the neighborhood, parking concerns of the immediate neighbors, sensitivity to the historic topography, archeology and geology of the site, sensitivity to the Yahara Parkway, presentation of the historic Hurd House and improvements to apartment buildings. He stated the building is still too massive and dense.
- The Friends of the Yahara Parkway feels that this project has not resolved any major issues. They feel the landscape issues have not been addressed to distinguish between private and public open space. The rain gardens included on the landscape plans they feel will not be adequate to provide the service they need. The massiveness and the height is just too much for this area.
- Lindsey Lee expressed concern that there is already a fair amount of density on the site but there isn't any relationship between the buildings.
- Anne Walker stated concerns with density and adequate parking. She stated that many of the houses in the neighborhood only have on-street parking as an option. She stated they are probably going to lose between 1-2 parking spots during the Merry Street reconstruction already, and Winnebago will be reconstructed and there is potential of losing parking spots there. She expressed concern over where the bike path joins the street near where the underground parking would be exiting Winnebago Street. She distributed pictures showing density, trash problems, parking, and hardscape. She was asked what sort of development she would envision in this space and said it would include ideas of sustainability, users of mass transit, canoers, kayakers. She would like to see the current buildings improved rather than build new ones.
- Peter Wolff brought up the issue of zoning in this area, as to how a 22-unit apartment building was constructed in an area of mostly single-family dwellings zoned R5. He noted between 1964-1995 there was no other large building of this scale constructed in this area.
- Karolyn Beebe spoke to issues of stormwater and flooding.
- Catherine Capallero expressed her opposition to the project's mass and density. She stated the fabric that holds their community and neighborhood together would be threatened by adding that many more people and cars to their little street.
- Gary Tipler distributed photos of the neighborhood during its planning and execution. He stated preservation of this historic site should be a considered.

Comments by the Commission were as follows:

- Why pursue without consensus with neighborhood.
- Project on the site a mistake in area of single-family homes, creates a new edge to Winnebago that is questionable.
- Question that 222 Merry Street was a mistake as built and sited.
- Topography is challenging. I have a lot of questions.
- This project somewhere else might be real nice. Concern with environmental sensitivity of the site, its prominence in the neighborhood. This isn't the highest use for this site. This site is not conducive to handling stormwater and parking.
- Presented as a financially driven cause. The density doesn't work here. This is an ill-advised project.
- The entrance/exit is too close to an intersection.

- Owner-occupied is not realistic in this economy with this project.
- Bring a site plan that shows the neighborhood as opposed to an aerial; can't see the hard surfaces.
- The context is inappropriate to the City and this area.
- The building is inappropriate for the topography and density.
- Smaller building, smaller building, smaller building. Smaller pieces climbing the hill as opposed to one big mass. The form of the mass is not appropriate.
- Next time you come in bring your previous versions of plans with you so we can see the process.
- Doesn't meet Comprehensive Plan, feel strongly about a well thought out plan, can't support.

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 2, 2, 3, 4 and 4.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1628 Winnebago Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	5	5	-	-	-	4	4	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	1	6	-	-	-	3	-	2

General Comments:

- Exceeds Comprehensive Plan. No neighborhood support. Sensitive environmental corridor.
- I think this is DOA.
- Does not meet City Comprehensive Plan – should not be brought back until it does (and has neighborhood support).
- Much too high density for this area.