

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: September 21, 2016

TITLE: 1109 South Park Street – New
Development of a 4-Story Mixed-Use
Building with Underground Parking in
UDD No. 5. 13th Ald. Dist. (42707)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: September 21, 2016

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 21, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for new development located at 1109 South Park Street in UDD No. 5. Appearing on behalf of the project were Alan Fish and Steve Shulfer. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Nick Badura and Jim Stoppie. Registered and speaking in opposition were Jim Winkle, Mark Schoendorff and Steven Keidl. Alan Fish described the changes that have been made based on the Commission’s previous review and comment of the project. The building is now setback from the alley, the front is 18-feet back from the curb with a full 15-foot setback on the fourth floor. The building has internally been broken up into three sections with separate entrances. The social room has moved to the rooftop next to the mechanical penthouse. The driveway has been moved to share an entry with the small alley along the back for less of a curb break. There is now a walkway between the gas station and the apartment building. The building has been moved back to create space and light. The developer is aware of the effect of shadows on neighboring homes. The height of the building is driven by the business plan for the building; they have reduced the plan from 47 to 39 units and reduced parking from 59 to 48 stalls. Building material samples were shown. To bring pedestrian life to the corner they created a large patio area with a couple of townhouse units they have added along Emerson Street. Shulfer discussed the use of building materials.

Jim Winkle spoke in opposition. He is a nearby resident whose home uses solar panels that would be affected by the height of this proposed building. He is for this development if they remain at three stories. The project is a vast improvement over the poorly maintained buildings that are there now. According to shade studies it is clear shading will occur about two hours before sunset. This would detract from the neighborhood.

Mark Schoendorff spoke in opposition. It is still too tall, and will negatively impact the area by casting shadows in the summer and limiting the ability to have a vegetable garden, casting shadows in the winter limiting solar gain, casting shadows on homes that have solar panels, decreased privacy, amplified sounds from events in the downtown and/or Alliant Energy Center, the height does not transition well to the neighborhood, the garbage enclosure being located too deep into the property likely causing an intrusive pick-up, no designated location

for plowed snow, a trellis wall that does not adequately block car lights, sound or any trash or debris, an outdoor seating area on Emerson Street rather than Park Street that decreases privacy and the peacefulness of the street, apartments with floor plans not being mirrored with bedrooms next to bedrooms, which would likely cause high turn-over, a rear parking lot that will cause too much traffic directed onto Emerson Street, as well as through the rest of the neighborhood, too much light from pole lighting, either direct or ambient into neighboring homes, encourages street parking as a shorter path for patrons to the front entrances, may get snow plowed in the middle of the night causing disruption to sleeping neighbors, may cause traffic issues with constant moving vans, the top floor should be the full footprint of the building and nothing more than mechanicals and a rain garden.

The Secretary emphasized the staff report from Jessica Vaughn, noting that not only does the zoning has issues with the height of the building, but the guidelines of Urban Design District No. 7 are also in conflict with the proposal. Specifically, “New buildings should generally be limited to four (4) stories in height. However, building height bonuses of up to two (2) additional floors may be allowed depending on the quality of the design...The bonus stories serve as an incentive for creative building design and should not be viewed as the permitted height.”

Steven Keidl spoke in opposition. He echoed the sentiment that the building should be limited to three stories. It would be good infill for the neighborhood. He shared concerns of other neighbors that could not be in attendance. This building does not positively contribute to the neighborhood and does not deserve extra bonus stories. There are significant issues with daylighting for neighboring properties. He has invested in solar for his home that will be affected. There will be a significant increase in traffic. Difficult financing requirements do not justify adding height to the building; the zoning is already designed to facilitate successful redevelopment as intended at an appropriate scale. Given the owner’s lack of large scale redevelopment experience, or large scale management, and proven long-term inability or refusal to maintain the current buildings, it would become more of a strain on the neighborhood. There needs to be a stepback on the back, the townhouses appear too small, the giant wall facing the neighborhood reflects sound from residents.

The Secretary noted that since this project has already been publicly noticed for the next Urban Design Commission meeting, it would be listed for referral if the current inconsistencies are not dealt with.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- We have no authority on solar issues, outside of recommending maximization of solar access, but no right to deny. Solar review was removed from our ordinances based on state statutes (staff).
- The blank wall concern is the lower level back wall?
- The corner element is still an issue; it’s not a glass corner, it doesn’t really address the corner itself. You have an offset that provides more of an outdoor eating area than anything. The building itself really doesn’t address the corner. We need a design that creates more emphasis that it is a corner, a tower element, more glass, something.
 - I consider this a tower element.
- The building is seemingly modern and yet here you’re using wood siding, that’s a little dissonance for me.
- There are too many building materials. Do you want it to read contemporary?
- The Planning and UDD No. 7 provisions talk about building corner presence. “New corner buildings should be located near the sidewalk edge and define the street intersection with distinctive architectural features such as towers, rounded walls, recessed entries or other design features.” We feel this doesn’t really do this.

- One of the comments I heard early on was an appreciation that we didn't have a tower because it's not mid-block and Emerson Street isn't a prominent street.
- The shadow studies are very important. You almost want to pull back from the corner for better visibility. But we really need those shadow studies with various options. If that corner piece were lowered, and you carried that back over the townhouse units to pick up some mass there, to see what that shadow would do to the houses on the other side of Emerson, rather than this really tall corner piece. See what that does for the sun.
- A more detailed, maybe hourly on some of the shadow studies having an impact, which are the winter ones. We need to have more sense of what the increment is.
- Study to what extent the 5th floor community room adds to the shadow because to me there is one potential solution for that.
- Can those townhouses blend in with the building better?
 - We can work on that.
- They also look extremely small, if they could blend in with the first and second floor, to almost the balcony, with maybe the same material versus how you have it here. I think you should be 3 stories, I don't know why you're trying to do more than that.
- This is a nice clean façade, this is just a mess. I wouldn't mind seeing something simple like this coming around the corner here. I agree bringing this down a floor rather than have a tower, it's a nicer scale for that side of the building and it's less busy.
- On the backside, span your balconies all the way across for more continuity. That would give a nice shadow line across the building.
- I have a concern that this can't impact the neighborhood too much. You've got to get better separation from the parking lot and the neighbors behind, that is not adequate to me. The line of screening.
- I need to hear from you next time you come back, how this really does merit bonus stories, because I really haven't heard how this helps the neighborhood. And that includes not just the neighbors behind.
- I like how you got rid of the extra curb cut, but this orientation looks straight back into the parking lot and backside of the building. If there's any way this can be more of a dog leg than straight in, I don't know if that's possible, but it would allow you to bring this line of the building to screen more.
 - We're trying to limit the amount of traffic going through the alleyway.
- It seems that maybe a tree or greenspace along that sidewalk would help soften that corner next to the townhouse units.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.