City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION		PRESENTED: January 10, 2018	
TITLE:	2901 University Avenue – Mixed-Use Development of Approximately 10,700 Square Feet of Retail Space and 52 Residential Apartments with Below Grade Parking Located in UDD No. 6. 5 th Ald. Dist. (48877)	REFERRED:	
		REREFERRED:	
		REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary		ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: January 10, 2018		ID NUMBER:	

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O'Kroley, Rafeeq Asad, Lois Braun-Oddo, Amanda Hall, Michael Rosenblum and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 10, 2018, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a mixed-use development located at 2901 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce, John Flad and Steve Short, all representing Flad Development. Registered and speaking neither in support nor opposition were Anthony Lathrop and Julianne Dwyer. The applicants presented changes made since their September 27, 2017 informational presentation; where comments suggested opening up the site, not linking the buildings, looking at a two building option (same comments from the neighborhood). Plans show the higher density mixed-use 5-story piece on University Avenue and a 2-story single-loaded townhouse along Harvey Street. They are able to meet the residential scale on Harvey while meeting the density requirements. Proposed signable areas were shown. They have incorporated more natural materials into the palette, including stone that wraps around the base, stimulated wood and green gray metal siding. The team reviewed the different views, describing the materials and transitions. The landscape plan was reviewed, noting a limitation on canopy trees in the center due to the parking deck below. The lighting plan shows LED fixtures with step lighting and bollards.

Anthony Lathrop: The neighborhood appreciates the team's response to their earlier comments, such as moving the mass closer to University Avenue, the increased use of "naturalish" materials. Two concerns remain: the neighborhood would benefit from the preservation of even one or two mature trees of the two dozen scattered across the four lots. It would ease the transition into the neighborhood as well as enhancing this "neighborhood in a forest." It would be nice to have a softer transition into Ridge Street, which could be done via a slight increase in the setbacks or stepbacks along Ridge Street.

Julianne Dwyer: She noted the neighborhood association had submitted comments. She inquired about signage; it was noted signage will meet Code or return to the Commission at a later date. She noted that the neighborhood association comments do address concerns related to signage. Street trees should not be relied on for canopy trees. They need to be able to maintain the existing canopy height. In terms of the stepbacks on the

higher floors, the renderings indicate it starts on the fourth floor, but the floor plans show the 3rd and 4th floors being the same. Where does that stepback come from, and can it be greater on the 4th and 5th floors?

Alder Bidar-Sielaff spoke, noting they have held 2 neighborhood meetings. The letter summarizes information and dialogue captured at the neighborhood meetings. People were generally pleased with changes and like the density on University Avenue much better, keeping the transition onto Harvey Street as being townhouses. The look and colors of the materials fit much better with the neighborhood. Given the extent of construction that will happen, it is going to be difficult to preserve many of the trees, but a solid landscape plan helps. The developer has agreed to use warmer light temperatures. Other issues brought up would be dealt with at the Plan Commission.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I think you've done as much as you can to fix or mend that transition into the residential neighborhood. I think it's a solid attempt to bridge that transition from residential to commercial; a much better project.
- You show windows on both sides of the commercial space, where is the back of the house?
 - We've got enough depth in this commercial space. We'll be able to put the back-of-house stuff internally, it's on the demising wall typically between commercial users but it's internalized.
 - We just finished a project at the corner of University Avenue and Shorewood Boulevard. It's turned out very well and was the first project that was true mixed-use with glass on both sides. We encouraged the tenants to create their bathrooms and storage in the middle of the space. When you drive by there you will see operational activity looking in the glass from University Avenue as well as from the parking lot side.
- What's the depth and size that you need to make that work?
 - The far east side is probably 50-feet of depth and you'll go down as far as 80-85 on the west side. For the record, we were brought into the development by the owners of the Harvey Street apartments. We thank you for your input, we had a lot of great input from that informational meeting. We think this is a better plan and the neighbors like it more.
- The landscaping looks nice. I question whether those trees on University have any chance whatsoever with the buses right along that edge. Is there anything else you could do along there?
 - Those will be City trees, we'll have to work with Forestry. We've also got Fire Department access needs along there.
- There's too much impermeable surface and I have concerns with stormwater management. Because of the setback from Harvey Street there is not enough setback to allow for large trees. Set the townhouses on Harvey back further to allow for larger trees. Harvey is not a major City arterial and needs a different treatment.
 - We do have a nice layered affect there at a height of 25-feet. The trees would have full-sized canopies.
 - We do have a fairly substantial setback itself off of Harvey. We're going to improve Harvey Street with the terrace, and curb and gutter. We've got more of a traditional neighborhood front yard. The landscape plan is pretty intense and layered.
 - The site has been getting squeezed as we go through all the City agencies.
- (Alder) There was some question by the owner of the building across the street, it is not a designated landmark. Amy Scanlon, the City's Preservation Planner does not think it warrants a landmark nomination.

ACTION:

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by Rosenblum, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0).