

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: January 2, 2019

TITLE: 1004 & 1032 S. Park Street – Alterations to a Previously Approved Commercial and Residential Project Located in UDD No. 7. 13th Ald. Dist. (46483)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: January 2, 2019

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Cliff Goodhart, Jessica Klehr, Rafeeq Asad, Tom DeChant and Craig Weisensel.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 2, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** to the design alterations. Registered in support of the project were Jon Hepner and Peter Pichotta, representing T. Wall Properties. Registered neither in support nor opposition was Lisie Kitchel. Registered and speaking in opposition was Ron Shutvet.

The original approval from 2015 was for 157 multi-family units (including five live-work units) and approximately 12,000 square feet of commercial space. In 2017 they returned with some foundation and footprint changes that resulted from conditions of the previous approval. Today they are requesting the conversion of 16 lofted units to add 16 additional units that would consist of one 1-bedroom, ten 2-bedrooms and five studio units for a grand total of 173 units, essentially changing the lofted fourth floor to a fifth floor. The fourth floor plan change at the end of the corridor accommodates the new stair tower coming off the roof deck down and will cantilever out as a soffit roof area at the fourth floor. The first floor height has decreased from 14 to 12-feet and adjusted other floor heights by 3-4 inches to accommodate the new fifth floor. Windows that were originally aluminum for the lofts are now single hung and operable.

Lisie Kitchel spoke to concerns with accuracies and inconsistencies with the submitted plans. Errors in the revised plans make it prudent to refer this item. Encourage attention to detail moving forward given these inaccuracies. The neighborhood has not had adequate time for review of the new plans. Light shielding from the new stair tower should be shielded, water quality and greenspace are also of concern. The impacts of poorly planned stormwater management continue to be a concern. Something more in keeping with the feel of the Bay Creek neighborhood should be substituted for the bright red Peloton sign. Bike parking spaces should be increased for both commercial and residential use. The extra traffic and congestion from additional units will impact the neighborhood.

- Are there inaccuracies to what we received?

- To the best of my knowledge, no.
- Has staff had time to do that kind of analysis?
 - There has been coordination with staff and the development team throughout to make sure that things were consistent between the letter of intent and the drawings. There were requests for the drawings presented so it was clearly indicated what was changing. There is an updated letter of intent on the table which clarifies a couple of things on the unit types. Those were the inconsistencies that were clarified during the process.
- Is it a City requirement that there be a 1-1 ratio of bedrooms to parking stalls?
 - I don't believe it is a requirement. They can request relief from that, especially in urban environments.
 - (Kitchel) I had been informed that it is the policy of the City that parking shall be provided at a 1-1 ratio.
- Will the landlord charge extra for parking?

Ron Shutvet spoke in opposition noting several inaccuracies in the letter of intent and the most recently drawn plans. The number of units are inconsistent in the approved and proposed plans. One letter says 162 units, there are only 151. For the proposed plans it says 173, there's actually only 167. Total number of bedrooms in the proposed plans are 209; they are saying it's going to be 215. Just on that alone, how can you move forward if the architect doesn't even know how many bedrooms or units are in the building? The address is not visible from all locations up and down Park Street and is partially blocked by the overhang on the roof. Page 20 of the plans is incorrectly showing the perimeter fence on the rooftop. The rooftop space does not appear to be handicapped accessible. There are no landscape features on the rooftop open space. The new stair tower needs more than one window to provide lighting and to break up that box shape. The added fifth floor apartments are like pigeon holes. You would expect the top floor of new buildings being built to have the best apartments. Those added 16 apartments are tiny with no balconies and only two windows. The neighborhood did not get adequate notice of these new plans.

The Commission discussed the following:

- If the letter of intent was updated on January 2nd why is it still dated October 30th?
 - That was just an inaccuracy.
- It should have had a new date on your submittal.
- I personally didn't get a chance to read your five page letter. Could you respond to those claims?
 - Sure. It was approved as 156 units and we're adding 16 apartments for 172 apartment units. The approval was for 157 units, 152 multi-family with 5 live-work. Our request is for an additional 16 for 173 units. I trust our architect to have provided plans that show 157 and then 173 units.
 - (Shutvet) They're wrong.
 - (Hepner) Further, in regard to the neighborhood association I'm not sure when they received the most recently submitted plans but I can say that after meeting with City staff I went out mid-October and spoke with a couple of members of the Bay Creek Neighborhood Association as those designated contacts, as well as the Alder on a number of occasions and have had his support from the get-go. I've been having ongoing discussions with the neighborhood association since mid-October.
 - (Shutvet) But you only submitted the plans to us December 26th. He's lying.
 - (Hepner) Regarding signage, we'll be back in front of this Commission for final signage approval. What's on the plans is a placeholder. The address is still in flux with the City and the location of the address on the building is currently as a placeholder.
- I'm glad the red is gone. I'm not a fan of the new proportions with the studios being on top. Those windows have gotten significantly smaller and changed the whole façade. Now you have little pigeon

holes and it changes the entire look. Was changing the loft to a studio the only option? That façade looked good and went through so many approvals to get there.

- My perspective is we tried to stick with the approved façade on that top portion as closely as we could while creating operable windows. With the units above it was easiest to create the same floor plan from below and pull that up above. We can look at enlarging those windows.
- The difference between those is pretty significant.
- There's quite a difference there.
- If you're putting four vinyl singles you're going to end up with a much bigger mullion. Is there a way to do a fixed top with an awning below?
 - I think it becomes a ventilation issue. Are you suggesting back to aluminum?
- It should be reworked and resubmitted.
 - I can rework, I'm just clarifying vinyl or aluminum?
- We're not prescribing the material, it's the aesthetic. If you have demising walls you may not do something 100% faithful to this but something much more in keeping with what was previously approved.
- Are those exterior HVAC units?
 - Yes they'll penetrate the wall but faces the patio, not Park Street or Fish Hatchery.
- I'm looking at the 5th floor plan, are they going to require a louver?
 - Those top floor units could easily be vented out through the roof, or a furnace system.
- In either case you can't put a window in front of them.
- I think parking is a concern that might even be in the purview of the UDC. It's tough to not be able to offer a place to park, and then throw another 16 cars out into the neighborhood. If we were to give an initial approval to send this to the Plan Commission, take the application that much further because it's definitely under their purview.
 - I've spoken with Planning staff and Traffic Engineering staff on parking, they're all comfortable and feel the amount we have is adequate. As part of our Council approval in 2017 we are required to include a parking stall with each unit up to 159 units because we have 159 parking stalls. Unless the tenant is able to prove (we're not sure how to go about this) they don't have a vehicle. We're also required to include a "community car" for our tenants to use and we're working with B-Cycle. This is a highly transit-oriented corridor. Ever since Wingra Creek opened is been nearly 100% occupied, there are 10 vacant parking stalls.
- Charging for parking does affect whether people will park on the street or not.
 - I've heard from many neighborhood residents that parking issues are created by employees of the hospitals and clinics in the area. We're going to do our best to mitigate that with parking in our building and parking passes. We're even suggested that if you see someone with our parking sticker on their car parked on the street, give us a call and we'll have a conversation with them about not parking in the street if they have a pass.
- I recommend that the rooftop patio be accessible to the public, not just exclusively to the commercial tenant.
- What type of commercial space would use that kind of patio?
- I don't understand denying the tenants access to that patio.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Asad for referral. The motion failed for lack of a second.

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Braun-Oddo, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1) with Asad voting no.

The motion provided for approval of the 16 additional units and the following:

- Redesign the 5th floor windows to be more reflective of the original approval;
- Redesign the 6th floor commercial space to have more windows;
- Provide access for tenants to the 6th floor roof top patio;
- Revisit Fish Hatchery and Park Street elevations and the transition from 5th to 6th floor – including the roof alignment of the Fish Hatchery 5th floor to extend to the prow, not cut short at the corner.