

AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: January 11, 2006
TITLE: 702 North Midvale Boulevard (Hilldale Shopping Center) –Amended PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development in Urban Design District No. 6. 11 th Ald. Dist.	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: January 11, 2006	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 11, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED CONSIDERATION** of the project at 702 North Midvale Boulevard.

Appearing on behalf of the project were Andy Stein, Robert Fink, Michael Sturm, Lee Pearson, Eileen Sohoeb, Chad Wright and Kyle Knop. Appearing in opposition to the project were Travis Carter, Vernon Barger, Peter Frautschi, Bill White, Lee Jennings, Susan Jennings and Annetta Barger. Appearing neither in support nor opposition were Jim Sykes and Fleming Crim. An overview was provided on the overall site plan, emphasizing the “Whole Foods” grocer site and condominium development with references to future development of the 30,000 square foot retail site (former location of the Hilldale Theatre) and future residential development along the easterly side of Sawyer Terrace. A detailed overview of the building elevations, site and landscape plans details were provided relevant to the “Whole Foods” grocer site, in addition to that for the proposed 90-unit condominium development. Following the presentation, Travis Carter, Peter Frautschi, Attorney Bill White and several area neighborhood residents expressed concerns about the project as summarized:

- Concern with rooftop treatments on the condominium building not being provided or adequately addressed.
- Concern with views, lack of open space, delivery hours and noise impacts from the loading area of the grocer and the lack of treatment of the rooftop of buildings and views are issues.
- Project lacks a master plan dealing with future and proposed development.
- Master plan details on the project deserves a “big picture” review.
- The Whole Foods building enjoys the best views, not the residential building as proposed.
- The proximity of the loading area to Westin Place Condominiums presents views into this area. Consider relocation to reduce noise and view impacts.
- The proposed trellis over the loading dock is not a roof which will relegate the noise issue.
- The projects needs an incentive to create open space and green amenities.

Following testimony by those raising concern on the project, the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- The applicant should examine providing alternatives for relocating the loading dock as discussed.
- There has been no response to look at alternatives as previously requested.
- No master plan has been provided as previously requested.
- A stormwater management plan was not provided within the submittal materials; therefore, no alternative stormwater solutions provided or addressed as previously requested by the Commission.
- The massive size of the surface parking lot for Whole Foods is still a problem, including size of curbs and radii.
- In regards to the condominium development, concern with nothing being done to ameliorate the view to and from the building.
- The grade level pedestrian experience is a harsh environment with no windows and a large retaining wall.
- Readdress surface parking lot issue; provide underground parking to eliminate the need for some of the surface parking.
- The proposed 30,000 square foot building lacks integration. The project lacks an overall master plan and greenspace.
- Past requests for stormwater infiltration plan alternatives were not provided. The plan that was distributed during the meeting is the same as previously proposed.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Host-Jablonski, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED CONSIDERATION** of the project. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-2-1) with March, Host-Jablonski, Wagner, Ald. Radomski and Geer voting aye, Barrett and Barnett voting no, and Feland abstaining. The motion cited inadequate address of issues raised during the hearing and as stated within previous Urban Design Commission reports on this project of July 6, 2005 and October 19, 2005 as follows:

- Ald. Radomski elaborated on neighborhood concerns on the lack of consideration for multiple use, mixed-use considerations proposed with the redevelopment, including provisions for multiple story buildings. He also raised concerns relevant to the configuration of Sawyer Terrace, its connection to University Avenue in regards to vehicle movement, along with the lack of the clarification of pedestrian/bicycle connections proposed with the Phase II redevelopment.
- The ideas from Phase I were lost with the Phase II development with its expanse of surface parking.
- The proposed demolition of existing buildings ignores their potential for adaptive reuse.
- The parking field on University Avenue does not provide a good pedestrian experience; buildings should front on University Avenue and screen surface parking areas.
- The redevelopment proposal does not utilize the significant grade variations on the site to allow for development of structured parking and reduced surface parking as proposed.
- Concern with flooding issues as it relates to the development of the substantive surface parking field; the applicant shall provide data on the impacts of the new design that provides for minimization of stormwater/flooding issues.
- The overall design with the Phase II development is comparable to the Home Depot east project featuring a large retaining wall along a major street frontage (University Avenue). In lieu of an expansive retaining wall system, the grade change lends ability for structured parking, in combination with creating buildings that relate to University Avenue. Reconfigure proposed surface parking to relate to the existing grades.

- The variation in grades across the Phase II development site can be modified to take advantage and provide more infiltration opportunities.
- The plan for Phase II is in contradiction to development in Phase I, in not creating an edge to the street.
- The lack of detail for the area east of the grocery store site, along University Ave. and the need for a more comprehensive site solution;
- The ground floor of the condominium building will not make a pleasant pedestrian experience;
- The lack of open space and linkages toward Rennebohm Park;
- Grocery store parking lot is not integrated with the rest of the development site;
- Consider a “green roof” and/or residential uses above the grocery store;
- Reduce the widths and radii of drives to make them more pedestrian friendly;
- View of grocery store and proposed condominium building roofs from Weston Place Condominiums.

In addition to the following:

- The applicant shall provide architectural drawings of rooftops on both proposed buildings which provide address of views, screening and green amenity issues.
- The applicant shall return with a series of different alternatives of an overall master plan to provide a basis for determination of the “best scheme,” alternatives or as proposed. Look at providing a roof over the loading dock to reduce noise, as well as view impacts.
- Serious consideration shall be made to provide a green roof (planted on both buildings).
- Provide relevant information on traffic impacts assessed in the memo raised by the Hilldale Committee of the Hill Farms Neighborhood Association to be addressed including signal issues and pedestrian connectivity to the neighborhood and existing parks.

A previous motion to reject the project by Barrett, seconded by Barnett, failed on a vote with Barrett, Barnett and Geer voting aye, Host-Jablonski, Wagner, March and Ald. Radomski voting no and Feland abstaining.

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 3, 3, 4.5, 5, 5, 5 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 702 North Midvale Boulevard

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	6	4	6	7	6	5	5
	5	6	5	6	-	5	5	5
	3 (Whole Foods)	8	4	4	-	4	3	3
	3 (Condos)	3	3	3	-	4	4	3
	6	9	8	8	7	6	6	7.5
	4	6	-	-	-	4.5	5	4.5
	5	5	5	-	6	5	5	5

General Comments:

- Concerns: too much impervious surfaces, fake windows; 50% over zoning standards for parking. Same big picture problems still exist.
- Consider roof over truck dock to decrease noise, provide a green roof extensive on both retail and condos for visual and infiltration. Rain gardens at a minimum within the parking lot, possibility of pervious paving in outermost stalls. Provide more comprehensive grading and stormwater management plan alternatives.
- Still not addressing many of previous UDC issues and neighbor issues.
- Too much parking (110 spaces more than zoning) and too much bordering University Avenue (see our current big box ordinance). Entry/exits allow too much vehicle speed (sweepingly large curb radii). Too much blank wall along Frey Street. There should be a green roof to mitigate view. The building presents a very fortress-like façade at ped level.
- All that surface parking troublesome, but probably unavoidable.
- Important questions remain unanswered at this key location. Despite good quality architectural design, key site issues, comprehensive planning and visual impact of roofs have not been addressed.