

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

## REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** June 22, 2011

TITLE: 925/945 East Washington Avenue &  
924/946 East Main Street – Mautz Site  
Redevelopment, Demolition, New  
Construction and Exterior Remodeling  
for Office/Manufacturing Uses in UDD  
No. 8. 6<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (22892)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

## REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: June 22, 2011

**ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Richard Wagner, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Mark Smith, Melissa Huggins, Jay Handy, Todd Barnett, Dawn O’Kroley and Henry Lufler.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of June 22, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for the Mautz site redevelopment, demolition, new construction and exterior remodeling in UDD No. 8 located at 925/945 East Washington Avenue and 924/946 East Main Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Doug Hursh and Mike Slavish, both representing Hovde Properties, LLC; and Lindsey Lee, representing the Preservation and Development Committee of the Marquette Neighborhood Association. Slavish gave an initial presentation on the site for redevelopment of the entire block, except for the credit union on the corner, with the intent of redeveloping the entire site and not just one building. As a former paint manufacturing facility there were three “hot spots” on the site. The tanks of been remediated and closed out and they have letters from the DNR stating as much. Working with the DNR has led to the solution of capping the site which includes the roadways, buildings and landscaped areas to serve as a cap for the remaining residual contamination. Because of this contamination all the buildings will be constructed from grade up and any buildings that would be built over what was that plume they would use some kind of vapor barrier. There should be no additional pumping needed. Hursh then presented plans for historically renovating the Mautz building. The backside has been covered in metal because of deteriorating brick. All new windows and energy standards will be incorporated into the new building. This building has a zero lot line even though the East Washington BUILD Plan calls for 15-foot setbacks. The buildings to be demolished are not of historical importance. The first phase of a complete build out focuses on the office building and parking structure, following the 15-foot required setback as well as the stepback on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor. Part of the East Washington BUILD Plan was to build 12-story buildings on this site, but they are proposing a 6-story building with smaller density. The parking structure is designed to be a 5-story structure. The more controversial portion includes a 24,000 square foot warehouse and retail component for a brewery, including a beer garden space. Off-street loading would be on Brearly Street. They want to develop a new site that has new buildings but also acknowledges the manufacturing/warehouse history of the neighborhood. The designs of new buildings will be based on the warehouse industrial concept. The Secretary reviewed various design requirements of the district in regards to stepbacks, setbacks and height and stated that when the applicant returns for initial approval, staff will provide a

report to the Commission on the project's consistency with the requirements and guidelines of Urban Design District No. 8/East Washington Avenue BUILD Capitol Gateway Corridor Plan.

Lindsey Lee spoke about the neighborhood's excitement of this project. The Marquette Neighborhood Association just last week passed a unanimous resolution in favor of this redevelopment. He also added that this project is a real testament to hard work that has occurred over the last 10 years – the BUILD Study, Capitol Gateway Neighborhood Plan. He thinks that work should be recognized. Huggins discussed the charette and what this development can do to not just turn their backs on the neighborhood. There is also the need for public open scattered space and she asked them to think about how phases one and two become public spaces and what their opportunities are for open space. O'Kroley agreed that East Main Street will need some livening up. She also questioned if it is indeed better to demolish buildings in favor of greenspace. Maybe there is a creative office facing East Washington Avenue rather than empty lots. Hursh replied that because of the contamination on the site it is recommended that they start from the ground up. It is possible they could leave some building façades, but it would be difficult to do. Wagner asked about the through connection from East Washington to Main Street. Hursh responded that the roadways or parking lots that are all on-site are proposed to be private. The tenant prospect for the light commercial building had expressed a strong interest in having a corner presence there. Discussion continued on the lot line setbacks, both as required by the BUILD Plan and by Urban Design District No. 8. Huggins commented that it would seem appropriate if the applicant could show a smaller setback to make a more functional floor plate and still preserve the Capitol Viewshed. Rummel stated that as important as this corridor is, a person is not going to spend time sitting on East Washington having a cup of coffee chatting with friends. She wondered if a 6-story building would need a setback at all. For her the parking structure is key; how does that look on Main Street and how this one-story warehouse function fit in without violating the plan. Barnett liked the idea and agreed that the 15-foot setback for 6-stories is something that would compromise the project. He would like to see the building edge with townhouses with offices spaces and the addition of one or two more floors. He wondered what would happen if the one-floor building were flipped so you get building edge on street edge. Hursh said they did look at that but it just reduced the square footage of the light manufacturing use, and the location of the parking and loading would be in the same zone. Barnett thinks they will have more conflict of people coming and going on the street than internally; maybe it's the kind of project that could use a mezzanine. Huggins liked the idea of doing something residential and wrapping it in office uses. She wondered if there was really a need for that much surface parking between the structured parking and the new building on East Washington Avenue. Instead of having the structure out to the corner try to bring it more internal to the site. The applicant stated that residential was not part of the original plan for this site and there has been some push back from that, as well as the difficulties imposed with the required setbacks. Harrington mentioned that a 15-foot setback could be used for sitting areas with lots of trees. The idea that you can create a double or triple row of trees and an open space should be considered. He would like to see further planning for a green roof and considered the possibility of retail with the structured parking. Smith remarked he liked the 6-story building with a 15-foot setback. He thinks they will have to find a way to do something on East Main with the parking structure; how it's occupied or what that occupancy is could be a lot of things. He suggested a double height structure; the idea of taking up half the block on East Main with an unoccupied façade is unsuccessful, at least at the sidewalk level. He urged them to think about that and spend some effort on what is really possible. Slayton suggested looking at pushing the parking ramp closer to East Washington, making the surface parking greenspace and putting all the parking in the structure, raising it as necessary. They have looked at moving the structure internal to the site, however it's not a very large site and that raises light/shadow issues. Huggins mentioned the possibility of the parking structure going over the top of the light manufacturing. Smith agreed that this was a very compatible use with the manufacturing aspects of the project as well as getting the cars internal to the site.

## **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 6, 6 and 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 925 + 945 East Washington Avenue & 924 + 946 East Main Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	6	7	-	-	-	5	6	6
	6	7	-	-	-	7	6	6
	6	-	-	-	-	6	9	8

General Comments:

- Good discussion.
- Great project/start. Look at flipping service entry to interior street.
- Good idea! Appropriate site use for East Washington, but where does Main fit in?
- Nice scale and initial concept (6-story building).
- Good beginning.