

**AGENDA # 7**

City of Madison, Wisconsin

**REPORT OF:** URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** June 28, 2017

**TITLE:** 1004 & 1032 South Park Street – Three Buildings of 3-5 Stories Containing 12,287 Square Feet of Commercial Space, Five Live-Work Commercial Spaces Totaling 7,337 Square Feet and 152 Apartments with Underground Parking in UDD No. 7. 13<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (46483)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Chris Wells, Acting Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** June 28, 2017

**ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant, John Harrington, Amanda Hall, Lois Braun-Oddo and Rafeeq Asad.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of June 28, 2017, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of new development located at 1004 & 1032 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jon Hepner, Matt Slonieczny and Rich Strohmenger, all representing T. Wall Enterprises; Randy Kalinske, representing Vierbicher; and Jeff Davis, representing Angus Young Associates. Registered and speaking in opposition were Ron Shutvet and Helen Kitchel. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak was Matt Lohmann.

No architectural changes on the exterior or prow have been made; interior changes have been made based on Planning staff’s comments and the Commission’s comments. The previously shown curved glass of the prow is now flat, with the overhangs on all three pieces reflecting that as well. The planters around the perimeter of both Park Street and Fish Hatchery Road have been dropped down so they can interact more with the street. The parking entry change brings the garage out to the front and moved to the corner to give cars more maneuvering room. The prow is over the property line on Fish Hatchery by about 4-feet. The building is up to the property line on Fish Hatchery Road, with each unit entry having a set of stairs, a patio and planter to buffer the entry from the sidewalk. They are willing to have a larger elevator for bicyclists rather than having a bike ramp down to the parking. Building material samples were shown.

Helen Kitchel spoke in opposition as a member of the Bay Creek Neighborhood. Some of the biggest concerns have been with density, parking and the commercial space. The present iteration doesn’t allow enough parking for one person per unit, and these are two-bedroom units; you’re possibly going to have two vehicles per unit with no allowance for any of the commercial space. The neighborhood is already heavily parked in by existing development and restaurants. The proposed flex time use of the parking spaces won’t work if the space is used for a restaurant. The entrance at the back of the building will significantly increase safety. The setbacks were greater with other iterations of the building; these are very busy streets and a very dangerous and busy

intersection. Development in the area has also affected water quality with run-off into the bay. The green roof proposes an excellent idea.

Ron Shutvet spoke in opposition. He does not think it appropriate to grant final approval; the neighborhood did not have sufficient time to review the plans. There is no commercial parking, where are customers and employees going to park? Flex parking isn't going to work here with secure garages doors, entrances and elevators. The lack of working towards a better solution is frustrating. Pedestrian/bicycle safety is a serious issue at this location. The traffic lights at Fish Hatchery and Park Street have a button for pedestrian crossing that is constantly ignored by drivers.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I worry about some of the details. When you look at the landscape plan with canopy trees in the easement, about 1/3 of the canopy is into the building and that's not reality. Doesn't make sense and it defeats the purpose; it illustrates that you can't fit very big trees along there realistically.
- At the prow there appears to be columns going from the exterior first floor and seem to disappear on the second floor behind the glass. How do you accomplish that?
  - The column will be behind the glass, it's not piercing the glass.
- The columns aren't shown in the floor plans either and it should be more accurate.
- Did you address the steepness of the bike entrance?
  - We can increase the elevator size to accommodate people with their bikes, and increase the lobby space. There's probably not a good way to reduce the steepness of the ramp due to the vehicles.
- What is your response to the comment on commercial parking?
  - We would do a shared parking plan. I think a lot of the overflow parking during the day is probably due to all the business, both customers and tenant usage in the area, but during the nighttime hour...we aren't planning on a restaurant tenant because we don't think a restaurateur will want this space. As Jeff had pointed out we need a conditional approval for a restaurant in here which is not something we're currently proposing. During the nighttime hours if restaurant tenants would have customers here, the parking in the Bay Creek Neighborhood would likely be more dispersed because the businesses wouldn't be using it. There are some spaces out on Park Street as well, we are at 159 parking stalls for 157 units. Based on our calculations from all our other stabilized properties, we are never fully utilizing all of our parking stalls, so we're comfortable with a shared parking program.
- You're saying there are still spaces on Park Street?
  - Yes. We did submit an updated traffic impact analysis with there being no issues with the reiteration in front of you now.
- You have spoken with Wingra Clinic?
  - Multiple times, and they said no multiple times. We'd be happy to lease stalls from them but there is no negotiation they want to have with us.
- For the commercial users, where do they do bike parking?
  - We do have a number of stalls on the surface, racks by the unit entrances and racks by the commercial entrances.
- This brick almost looks like concrete block. Everywhere else I look the brick turns the corner like it should. For consistency the brick should turn the corner.
- I think this building has grown too big. You don't have setbacks for the greenspace you need to have. You've got to get canopy trees in there but I don't see how you can do that. These canopy trees are part of our infrastructure, not just aesthetic. I'd like to see shadow studies for your courtyard because your

species aren't going to grow there. You really need to think about how to get more greenspace in there. You just have to find a way to get more space in there.

- What do you think is the right amount of space?
- I thought what you had last time was the minimum, and now you've pushed the two sides out more. It's too far.
  - Part of that is the dedication of the 6-foot right-of-way.
  - To go back to the footprint we had we'd be at 0.75 parking stalls per unit.
- But the reality is this: if you had to adjust for a gas line you would. Trees are just as important on so many levels. The research out there is tremendous on that.
- In front of the live-work units where it's setback and lower, that's your opportunity to get wide-ranging canopy trees.
- Can you speak to accessibility into the live-work units?
  - There's a ramp here and there's going to be a doorbell type scenario where those units can open the gate to allow someone to come in. And maybe during business hours that gate is unlocked.
- If you can introduce some more playfulness within the windows on Park Street.
- With initial we'd be approving the footprint and I don't know if I'm quite there, with the landscaping comments and the traffic safety comments. If initial would move it forward to the Plan Commission to have that discussion...I would reserve our ability to continue to request the footprint have minor modifications for those traffic concerns.
  - Footprint is a fundamental thing so if you want to change that I would not recommend initial because that usually implies that you guys are OK with the footprint as presented.
- Without changing the footprint of the building could you do some indentations on the Fish Hatchery side going up that would give you space for trees?
  - It's challenging.
  - The Fire Department has a lot to say about the spacing and height of trees too.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Asad, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-3) with Goodhart, Asad, DeChant and Hall voting yes; and Braun-Oddo, Harrington and O'Kroley voting no.

The motion provided for the following when the project returns for final approval:

- Accurate views down both Park Street and Fish Hatchery Road showing the accurate rendering of trees and landscaping, realistic canopies so we get a real sense of what you're trying to accomplish there.
- Some study of the shading within the courtyard.
- Clarification on the bike lobby design.