

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: May 24, 2006
TITLE: 505-550 Midvale Boulevard, Midvale Plaza Redevelopment, PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development. 11 th Ald. Dist. (02988)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: May 24, 2006	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 24, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP), mixed-use development for Midvale Plaza located at 505-550 Midvale Boulevard.

Appearing on behalf of the project were Ald. Tim Gruber, Paul Cuta, Bruce Simonson, Joseph Krupp, Chris Armstrong, Rachel Martin and Laura Brown. Appearing in opposition to the project were Don Severson, Bonnie McMullin-Lawton, Paul Haskew, Denise Lamb, Bill Orosz, Pat Christy, Brenda Sebel, Tom Talerico Anna Strenski, Pamela Mather, Michelle Quinn, Steven Welch, Anna M. Spengler, Paul Baker, Nancy Kendrick, Brandon Casto, Mariah Quinn and Kyle Friedow. Appearing neither in support nor opposition was Mark Shahan.

The primary modifications of the plan consist of the following:

- The northerly access to lower level parking off of the northeasterly corner of the Phase II structure on Caromar Drive has been eliminated in favor of a driveway access off of the northwesterly corner of the Phase II development on Midvale Boulevard.
- The four-story element along Midvale Boulevard has been moved inbound facing onto the interior courtyard allowing for setbacks and stepbacks as previously proposed. The second entry to the Library Building has been added at the center of the lower level façade directly opposite the parking lot entry to the building on Tokay Boulevard.
- The applicant noted that the relocated driveway entry to lower level underground parking on Midvale Boulevard was conditional on whether the residential units within Phase II were rental or owner-occupied. The applicant requested the option to relocate the driveway to Caromar Drive if developed as owner-occupied condominiums due to market issues. The change from rental housing to condominium development would result in a downward adjustment of units from 100 to 75 units within Phase II.
- Krupp emphasized his opinion that the project was consistent with the provisions of the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan relative to mixed-used districts. In addition, it was noted that conditional approval was requested for the overall PUD(GDP) for the redevelopment proposal with PUD(SIP) approval only for Phase I consisting of the southerly ½ of the development site including the library, various retail/commercial tenants spaces, and upper level residential development.

Following the presentation, area residents registered in opposition, distributed several handouts to the Commission and spoke in length on details within the distributed information relevant to density, traffic impacts, design, retail issues, and overall neighborhood compatibility concerns relevant to the redevelopment proposal. Several neighbors registered in support spoke favorably on the project and its relative merits. Ald. Tim Gruber spoke in support of the project noting the modifications to provide for dual entry to the Library Building and supporting Urban Design Commission approval based on neighborhood input with a request that the Commission look at pedestrian connections such as the stairway at Caromar Drive along with examining the different sizes and configurations of apartments and condos within the redevelopment proposal. Ald. Gruber noted his previous non-support of the project was affected by input from a recent planning conference “Nolen to Now” recently held at Edgewood College; which provided a better perspective on urban infill development such as the project as proposed.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Concern was expressed that the revised entry treatment for the library portion of the property did not provide for activation at the corner taking advantage of the civic nature of the building. Paul Cuta, representing the library, noted that future refinements to its design would address this issue in combination of creating a grand reading room area on this portion of the site.
- Relative to architecture, concerns were expressed as was previously stated with earlier considerations of the project with the introduction of traditional forms of architecture of this period in neighborhood; seems out of place. The project as currently proposed, appears to be a continuance of the same architectural form and style as previously requested to be modified by the Commission.
- Not persuaded that the project will negatively affect the neighborhood.
- Could be persuaded that corner plaza area could be further designed without acting as an entry feature to the library but disappointed with the loss of the alley pass-thru.
- Still concerned that previously stated issues with the landscape and site plan have not been addressed in addition to the elimination of the corner entry to the library where a large space/place needs and is provided with no program activity with nothing designed, happening and no active uses.
- Landscape plan still has issues. The red-twigged dogwood in front of the library is too tall and is inappropriate. Bicycle parking off of a stairway off of Caromar Drive is an issue, as well as other small issues relevant to the site landscape plan need to be resolved.
- Relevant to the garage issue, entry off of Midvale versus Caromar Drive, maintain the Midvale entry regardless of residential use either as condominiums or rentals.
- Need to resolve driveway cut-thru issues between Midvale Boulevard and Caromar Drive with the incorporation of traffic calming measures.
- Examine the possibility of providing for all retail along the ground floor level on Midvale Boulevard in addition to a full four stories.
- Like efficiency of the project in regards to access to services.
- Need to see more details on tree islands.
- Bothered by the lack of activation on the corner of Tokay and Midvale Boulevards; no pedestrian movement in area. The architecture is too busy with no synergy; façade is a bit overworked with too much of a variety of different things.
- No serious reservations on the project as a whole, share reservations of neighbors on four versus three stories, four stories along Midvale Boulevard could be explored.
- More concern with architecture not right for this neighborhood. Reluctant to approve. It is based on promise of future work, need more than tweaking, needs more work on architecture.

- Have strong architectural concerns relative to holding of the corner and prefer four stories at inter-court as proposed because Midvale is still a low-rise street.
- The building needs to be simpler, less color. Needs to look like a commercial building not a house.
- Concern with library reading like a library. Too many things going on architectural with no unifying elements across the façade.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion required the following:

- The architecture shall be reexamined to simplify and provide for unifying elements with consideration for reestablishing the cut-thru as well as providing more attention to the corner treatment at Tokay and Midvale Boulevards.
- Reexamine the mechanical room at the corner of Caromar Drive and Tokay Boulevard to incorporate a rain garden and more open space. Strong encouragement to reestablish the previously approved cut-thru off of Midvale Boulevard.
- The direction of architecture still is not appropriate in context to neighborhood; modify as previously requested.
- The garage entrance is to be maintained as shown on the Midvale Boulevard regardless of its future residential use either condominiums or rental units.
- Coordinate with Madison Metro the maintenance of the bus stop adjacent to the redevelopment site.

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 5.5, 6, 6, 6.5, 7 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
Member Ratings	7	7	-	-	-	6	8	7
	6	5.5	6	6	-	6	7	6.5
	-	6	7.5	-	-	6.5	7	7
	6	6	5	-	-	6	7	6
	5	5	6	-	-	5	5	5
	6	6	7	6	-	7	7	6
	5	6	4	6	-	5	6	5.5

General Comments:

- Appropriate scale for a neighborhood center – excellent urban design.
- Building architecture is overworked. This is a neighborhood center and can compliment the existing neighborhood and also be different. Less color, fewer material and façade change would be preferred. Let the library read as a library – distinct and different from residential buildings.
- Architecture needs work: it’s currently too chaotic, too polychrome, and does not express the library as an integrated entity. Improvements to massing and access.
- Looking forward to receiving the next iteration that “unifies” and “simplifies” the 2 buildings. Also look forward to library architect designing a civic building, including an engaging corner. Also, keep ingress/egress of Phase II building off of Midvale, not Caromar.
- Architecture still doesn’t belong in this neighborhood. Still would be better if only 3 stories.
- Nice project overall; this will be a very nice town center. The one major drawback is the lack of civic, pedestrian activated corner at the intersection of 2 major streets.
- Architecture still feels incongruous with neighborhood. Egress off of Caromar to Midvale good. Street entry for library good. Lower parking garage...to lower building (at residential component). Full building footprint of library to east to allow for corner entry for retail. Increased retail possible with locking businesses in? Prefer retail “court” effect. Disappointed to lose cut-through from Midvale to parking court.
- Alternative underground entrance off Midvale is preferred. Entrance off Tokay is acceptable for the library. Bike parking off stairs is not very practical. Moving of the bus stop west of Midvale Boulevard on Tokay is contrary to safety and use. There are still problems with the parking lot layout including the small island sizes and parking along main lot entrance. Large size shrubs like red twig dogwood is not appropriate here. Ribbon style racks not acceptable, 4-racks are preferred. Corner Midvale/Tokay plaza out of proportion if no activity is planned.