

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> May 3, 2006	
TITLE: 505-550 Midvale Boulevard, Midvale Plaza Redevelopment, PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development. 11 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (02988)	<b>REFERRED:</b>	
	<b>REREFERRED:</b>	
	<b>REPORTED BACK:</b>	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b>	<b>POF:</b>
DATED: May 3, 2006	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>	

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Ald. Noel Radomski, Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Lisa Geer, Robert March and Michael Barrett.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 3, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of the Midvale Plaza Redevelopment, PUD(GDP-SIP), mixed-use development located at 505-550 Midvale Boulevard. Appearing in support of the project were Judy Olson, Barbara Dimick, Bruce Simonson, Joseph Krupp, Paul Haskew, Earl Reichel, Gary Poulson, Tim DeVries, Karyl Lynn Bruckner, David Ewanowski, Chris Armstrong, John M. Kelly and Scott Kelly. Appearing in opposition to the project were Bonnie McMullin-Lawton, Don Severson, speaking on behalf of Nancy Kaczmarek, Kurt Kaczmarek and Miriam Levinson; Jeff Eaton, Tom Talerico speaking on behalf of Kyle Friedow, Margaret Hoffman and Paul Haskew; Denise Lamb, Astrid Newenhouse, Bill Orosz, Heidi Fatland, Mike Hammers, Steven P. Welch, Kathy Warren, Pamela K. Mather, speaking on behalf of Andrea Konik; Anna Strenski, speaking on behalf of Paul Hamelink and Michelle Quinn; and Tim Gruber. Krupp provided an overview of the project against elements of the recently approved comprehensive plan, an excerpt of which was distributed to the Commission. Krupp noted that the comprehensive plan was the basis for development of the project in absence of a specific neighborhood development plan for the area. Simonson noted that initial approval for the overall master plan combined with approval for the Phase I of the development consisting of the residential condominium above the first-floor library and retail space along Tokay Boulevard. Simonson detailed site aspects along with context for the development. Simonson elaborated on the ground floor access to units along Caromar Drive, along with review of various building levels with setback and step backs emphasized in correlation with the various building elevation facades, including details for a colonnade along the property's frontage at ground level on Tokay Boulevard on the proposed library's facade. In addition a review of potential possible pedestrian entry treatments to the library. Concerns relevant to the continued emphasis on providing a main entrance to the library from the parking lot side of the development were questioned against the need to provide for an appeal to foot traffic by the Commission. Judy Olson, representing the Friends of Sequoya, spoke to the need and desire to maintain and expand the library in its existing location as part of this redevelopment. Several area residents speaking in opposition to the project noted the issues as follows:

- The architecture, scale and density doesn't fit the neighborhood context.
- Access to the library issue, as well as orientation to the parking lot, is not resolved.
- Concerned with the amount of rental housing in area of owner-occupied housing, along with the reduction and retail space within the new plan vs. existing.

- Following review of elements of a neighborhood opinion survey, referral was requested for redesign to meet the expectations and concerns of neighbors.
- Issue with residences accessing onto residential streets, the developer applying an urban context and scale of development inconsistent with single-family nature of the area, not more than two stories.
- Concern with lighting, signage and landscaping. The current plan has no reference to lighting, lighting of signage, hours of lighting, lighting levels, with little or no signage details shown on proposed plan in regards to retail, residential and library uses.
- The landscaping within the courtyard planning; survival is an issue.
- Need more detail on roof gardens above library. Overall design should include more green space and public areas.
- Concerns were raised with neighborhood's ability to respond to any lights, landscaping and signage proposals yet to be formulated.
- Want more green vs. paving proportions in parking lot.
- The lack of access to library from the corner of Midvale and Tokay Boulevards was noted, mixed with the pedestrian cut through is not the final design, a scary and unsafe passageway mixed with backing out vehicles conflicts with the Midvale Boulevard driveway access.
- Traffic impacts require a multi-modal traffic study.
- Adequate loading not provided for various uses and need to restrict pickup delivery hours.
- Concern with mass more than height within a primarily single-family area.
- Make better use of Tokay Boulevard and scrap use of Caromar Drive by providing access to and redeveloping site layout.
- Need scaled model to compare heights of proposed development with existing surrounding neighborhood buildings.
- Need a more accurate shadow study. Previous studies omit periods of daylight.
- The apartment / condominium side of the project grossly underdone in regards to parking. People will be parking on street.
- In regards to the comprehensive plan, the project is not a compatible scale and density of the neighborhood area. The project eliminates and does not maintain existing retail, provide for community gathering, doesn't enhance neighborhood character.

Following testimony against the project, Ald. Tim Gruber spoke noting the following:

- A library entrance from Tokay at the street or corner or similar alternative needs to be provided.
- Supports neighborhood on too high building height.
- Wants Urban Design Commission to examine if varying shapes and sizes of windows will make the project appear more compatible with the adjacent neighborhood.
- Also concerned with left turn and cutoff at Midvale Boulevard driveway and vehicle conflicts.
- Would support consideration for raising sidewalks for grade separation of proposed residential use.

Following discussion on the item, the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- Corner at Tokay and Midvale Boulevards, library as it relates to phase is yet to be resolved, yet to be seen. Basic site relationship needs to be resolved in order to go further.
- Support corner entry; also problem with symbolic treatment of building.
- Concern with residential units being either one and two bedroom. A need to provide units with greater numbers of bedrooms to create a more diverse housing for families with children rather than young professionals.
- There is also an issue with rental vs. condominium development in support of more owner occupancy.

- Concern with the Caromar Drive northerly driveway located at the curve. Need to consider relocating to Midvale Boulevard.
- Relevant to architecture, penthouse should be treated as part of architecture not as subdued, need more of a modern aesthetic to have a more compatible style with neighborhood. It's history and character need more emphasis also a lot of merits to the project.
- Relevant to site layout, don't want to see a library that doesn't have an entrance to the street facing Midvale or Tokay Boulevards including retail.
- Like green roof, but not very detailed regarding its green elements.
- Need more detail on the infiltration facility, soils and bio retention.
- Concern with the number of exits onto Caromar Drive, spill out traffic utilizing other opportunities on other streets, having three ingress / egress points on a not wide residential street at issue with underground parking considerations.
- Width of planting areas are insufficiently sized, need to find more space or design with better soils; a maintenance issue. The amount of area that trees have, an issue with survivability, need to provide more water to tree roots, utilizing permeable pavers installed adjacent to trees.
- Need more public green space or the sidewalk along Midvale Boulevard, along terrace should be considered.
- Consider raised walks for traffic calming along Midvale Boulevard.
- Three to four stories on Caromar Drive pushing it. Comfortable with three on Midvale (questionable four), two along Caromar Drive, with both condominium and rental units requiring more diversity in bedrooms.
- Relevant to the urban context, Midvale area is not a typical arterial street, is not much commercial, a more residential, arterial street makes it appropriate to scale back the project.
- Consider pulling the northwest corner of the building of Phase II to create a lower level alley to underground parking and relocate driveway off of Caromar Drive to Midvale Boulevard to give neighbors some relief.
- Lower parking garage along Caromar Drive to reduce overall building height.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by March, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of the project, noting that it was uncomfortable with the four stories of the project, as proposed and noted in its previous review, with any modifications to the project to maintain the proposed step backs with the second floor to come out and losing upper stories. The motion was passed on a 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 4.5, 5, 5, 6 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 505-550 Midvale Boulevard**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5	8	8	-	-	5	5	6
	5	6	-	-	-	5	4	5
	5	6	5	-	-	5	5	5
	8	5	7	8	-	6	7	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.5

General Comments:

- If library wants to be a signature architectural statement/design, then why have the library entrance to the parking lot? Reduce scale and investigate reducing heights along Caromar – retain stepbacks and setbacks! Library has to decide then bring back versus a full site plan – with entrance/exit along Midvale and/or Tokay. Change architectural style to be more accommodating to residential neighborhood.
- Well designed but a bit too dense. Could it be scaled back? Also library entrance a problem.
- Library should make a civic statement, namely a grand high profile main entrance that enlivens the corner of Tokay and Midvale. Top floor is architecturally weak. Building setback widening the sidewalk is an amenity that off-sets the drawbacks of larger buildings. Site plan is very nice for pedestrians.
- Architecture should relate more to existing neighborhood houses – older style is not appropriate, 3-stories.
- More screening of the parking lot from the residential properties on Caromar. Also screen the loading dock or parking entry. Urge an entrance for the library off Midvale Boulevard or Tokay. Restudy residential ingress and egress onto Caromar, look at dividing or changing to Tokay. Provide larger islands for plants or move to a permeable paving with structural soil in the parking lot.
- Consider alternative treatments for penthouse; long unpunctured (no windows) at Caromar is concerning; would corner element be an entry? Looks like it should be. Pluses: Site plan concept, library location, passage from Midvale, impervious area % down. Minuses: Number of stories, penthouse architecture, no street entry from street, architectural style.
- Too much for this site. Too tall. Library must, as an urban design issue, have good pedestrian access from the corner as well as the parking lot.