

AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: December 9, 2015
TITLE: 820 South Park Street – TSS-TRV1, Multi-Phase Affordable Housing Development in UDD No. 7. 13 th Ald. Dist. (40093)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: December 9, 2015	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Slayton, Acting Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Lois Braun-Oddo, Sheri Carter, Tom DeChant, Michael Rosenblum and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 9, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a multi-phase affordable housing development in UDD No. 7 located at 820 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Donald Schroeder, representing J.T. Klein; and Abbie Moilien, representing Ken Saiki Design. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Zia Brucaya, representing J.T. Klein. Registered and speaking in opposition were Marissa Burack and Jason Hagenow. Changes to the plans show 3-stories along Haywood Drive and a roof terrace patio addition. They went back to larger “bubble” bays that look down the street towards the lake. They also simplified the roof form has been simplified and the massing of the corner element. Landscape changes include the addition of a south rooftop patio with raised planters, the courtyard has been reworked as a buffer of raised planters to create the space. Artificial turf is recommended to be used in the “tot lot.”

Marissa Burack spoke in support of affordable housing but would like to see some major changes as a neighbor living one block away. This development does not meet the threshold to be granted 5-stories as a reward for innovative design. Innovative, timelines and creative are not words she would use to describe this project. Looking at the project from Brooks Street it looks like a stack and she has concerns about how that is going to visually appear from Brooks Street. An urban design looks fine on Park Street but not so good mixing with the rest of the residential neighborhood. She doesn't see how the children will get to the tot lot having to go through the parking lot.

Jason Hagenow spoke to concerns about the tot lot and the second phase of the building possibly not being done right away. The trash chute doesn't go all the way up. In terms of the bays, it seems that the bigger windows would be better facing the lake and maybe the bay windows going to the back. He questioned why this is sometimes talked about as one building and other times it's two. The idea of adding or increasing the space to give more usable space to all the residents would be a good idea. Not being a super innovative and unique design, this shouldn't be granted any extra bonus stories.

Jay Wendt noted the issues more relevant to the Commission. One of the things the project team is looking for is clarification in regard to the Urban Design District No. 7: can they be met? Is there a clearer vision about whether or not the standards for exceeding that height can be met with your initial approval? That's the one clarification we really need to have. The 3-story element along Haywood Drive was approved by the Plan Commission, the color alternatives need guidance.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- It's an improvement and going in the right direction. I have a pretty good grasp of what I see on the corner along Park Street, but with the change to the 3-story element on Haywood, because there's a lot of stacking and a lot of different masses, I'm really looking for some perspectives down the street to help understand the context better, help understand the depth of different things that are going in and out there; how massing is stacked and the setback. Looking flat on, the elevation doesn't look any different than when it was 4-stories. I personally prefer the blue bays, not iridescent.
- Along Delaplaine Street I like the way you've done the porches with the one roof and I like the bays as you've brought those together. It's much more successful there. The sloped tower element which you brought down here, all of those things really start to bring it into a really cohesive corner, I'd just like to see that the other angles, and maybe I will when you representing it 3-dimensionally.
- I still share the concerns about 5-stories backing all the way up to the parking lot. I actually don't have a problem with the 5-stories on Park Street. I would love to see you reduce that 5-story element on the backside.
 - Staff looked at what the distance is from our building and single-family homes versus what has been approved in that corridor, like Lane's and the Ideal.
- The Ideal steps down.
 - It specifically lists out 4-story building, how far it is, 5-story building, how far it is, and they're all closer than what we're doing here.
- If projects are in context with themselves.
- Problem with the toning of the green accent, material sample would help.
- I feel like this is kind of squat and bulky feeling. If it's not going to align here (adjacent brick veneer features adjunct to metal panel) I'd rather see it come up higher and give it a bit more of an elongated skinny and maybe not even bring it back so far. It seems bigger than it needs to be for an accent; add a reveal.
- Is there any thought to lighting of that element?
 - For sure there will be lighting on the bottom. We'll have to look at different ways to do that, maybe recess it or something.
- As I drive down Park Street, this bothers me, what am I not seeing (beyond the accent piece)? The vertical is really strong but this is not. I look at this standing up there like a beacon and this is pushed down, I don't know if you can go any higher but to me it looks like it wants to be. Like to see more on the Park Street façade beyond the corner element; the top of the tower element appears squat.
- Maybe a combination of all these comments and really reworking that corner and the windows up on that top floor, make that an element and less a continuation of those other bays and something really unique.
- The corner works relatively well, but to get it all to blend from each view (adjacent elevational features), that's what we're looking for.
- How long is the billboard going to be up there?
- I do have concerns with the tot lot and how you get to there.

Wendt asked that the Commission make a finding to whether or not the district standards can be met in relation to the additional height request. This is a WHEDA project that has timelines. Projects must attempt to meet the guidelines. In working with the applicant, can we get to a design you feel is creative enough to warrant that bonus height?

- I think steps have been made in that direction, but I think there's more to be done to have all steps (elements and features of the architecture work together) in total.
- Are the things that have been said objective enough that you feel you've been given enough direction to get what we need?
 - Yes, if that's the main focus I can understand the additional things that need to be addressed.
- I like the rooftop plan and the terrace.
- I think the most important thing is to tell them what they need to get final approval. They already have initial.
- I would like to see the whole material palette together because I couldn't tell if the green goes well with whatever brick is proposed. It's not whether I like the green or the blue it's how it looks altogether.
- It's misleading that this green is set against other colors that are not that dark, but it stands out on the board because of the dark background. On the corner it somewhat rushes into the other colors; as an accent piece, it's not a great accent.
- I like it better now that I've seen the color of the other materials, I do like the green, although I think the color is slightly off.
- We see this design a lot, I'd like to see something just a little bit different that actually gives something unique to the street, just a little bit more oomph.
- It's easy to say it could be met, but without seeing it...
 - It's similar to other projects you saw tonight. Are you comfortable enough with the massing and height to push this project forward? You obviously want to see more design work and more refined, but can they get there, get their full entitlements and then come back to see you with their WHEDA credits in hand?
- My concern is still going to be the 5-story backing up to this.
- It's a partial height approval.
 - That can be part of your motion as well, that you want some consideration made to how that relationship works.
- How far back are you uncomfortable with 5-stories?
 - (Applicant) I've already dropped 8 units from the project. Trying to build an affordable housing project where you have a 25% WHEDA to 25% AMI, \$400/month...
- We've been instructed not to be concerned with that.
 - It just doesn't work, this is my breaking point here. We've gone down from 125 units to 95 units, we've stepped it back and met the 45-degree angle by doing that for that zoning district.
- I do think of the way the Ideal steps back and is much better integrated. We don't have that kind of consistency of planning for Park Street the way we do for East Washington Avenue.
- In terms of the relationship of the rear of that elevation to the single-family homes behind it, that's what the staff report was trying to say. This is greater than those other projects in terms of the separation of an actual larger building between a single-family residence.
- 15-20-feet back I think would start to make a big difference.

ACTION:

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item to provide address of the issues stated. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-2) with Harrington, DeChant, Rosenblum and Carter voting yes; Goodhart and Braun-Oddo voting no.

A previous motion by Goodhart, seconded by Braun-Oddo, to grant initial approval **FAILED** on a vote of (2-4) with Goodhart and Braun-Oddo voting yes; DeChant, Harrington, Carter and Rosenblum voting no. The motion asked that the applicant further study and significantly refine the corner element on Park Street, as well as study the massing and mix of materials of the rear elevation along Haywood Street with three-dimensional exhibits. In addition, to work out a safer path for access to the tot lot. The motion is making a finding that they can find the additional height acceptable per UDD No. 7 in the failed motion.

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 rating for this project is 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 820 South Park Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5