

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** October 3, 2018

TITLE: 1202 S. Park Street – New Development of
a Permanent Supportive Housing Project
Containing 58 Residential Units and
Approximately 1,200 Square Feet of
Commercial Space Located in UDD No. 7.
13th Ald. Dist. (52903)

REFERRED:
REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: October 3, 2018 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Cliff Goodhart, Rafeeq Asad and Michael Rosenblum.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 3, 2018, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of new development of a permanent supportive housing project located at 1202 South Park Street located in UDD No. 7. Registered in support of the project were Matt Melendes, Mark Kruse, Paul Mellblom, Kandyse McCoy-Cunningham, Lisa Kuklinski, Ann Panopio, Fatima Benhaddon and Gerard Campbell, all representing Heartland Housing, Inc. Registered and speaking in opposition was Dave Vogel.

Melendes introduced the team and reviewed a history of the project origination and process. Five community meetings have been held where they received feedback on design and function. They wish to start construction in 2019 and have put a lot of effort into an energy efficient building and connecting people to resources. The project is seeking WHEDA credits. The building sits between two public streets where Park Street meets Olin Avenue. The L-shaped building sits about one-foot from the property line, with a drive going underneath the building to parking. A retaining ground wall has been eliminated at the suggestion of Police, as well as use of shrubbery that could not hide a person. The building entrance is on High Street. There is retail area on the first floor as well as Heartland Housing offices. The front desk will have visibility on both doors, plus lighting and cameras. The two lower levels are brick, with a stepback of 15-feet above the second floor, and cement board above to give a quieter, more subtle design. Renderings with dashed lines showed the sides of the buildings along the property line and adjacent buildings. 3D views put the building in context, showed it from various locations and showed how it fits with the existing adjacent buildings. Parking is prioritized for residents first at no charge; they commissioned a parking study and found that parking on the opposite side of High Street is available without a permit. Staff would include a full time property manager, front desk and maintenance staff. At any given time there could be up to 3 property management staff on-site, as well as supportive services staff at approximately 3 full time employees with staggered shifts. They do provide their staff with bus passes. Park Street is about 3-4 feet higher than High Street so the first floor datum is set at Park Street. A decorative fence will be used rather than the originally planned retaining wall that should not be visible from the street.

Dale Vogel spoke in opposition to the project. His concerns include how these projects are managed (he referenced another Heartland project with management issues), the minority-owned businesses on either side of this site who cannot afford what goes on with this type of management, and too few parking stalls on-site. This is not a good location for this project.

The Commission discussed the following:

- I don't understand why you have a planter with a fence around it.
- What are the sight lines from the roof terrace/common space to the backyards of houses on Fish Hatchery Road? What do the neighbors think about having an elevated platform of people looking down on their property?
 - We need to have the roof as an accessible open space to meet the UDD No. 7 criteria.
- The issue is cramming too much into too small a space.
- The setback from Park Street should be 13.5 feet, like other recently approved projects. The City has an interest in having that setback.
 - We can't push it back any further because we'd have to give up dwelling units. We meet the current code required setbacks.
- (From Ald. Arnsten) The High Street façade is of issue. There's a lot of blank wall space.
 - The stair tower goes down through here. We could add more windows if you would like. This is one of the dwelling units and the central corridor that goes through the building.
- How do you get bikes downstairs?
 - There's an elevator that comes through the garage on the High Street side.
- The west location has better access to bike storage. I don't see any outdoor storage here. This plan looks like a real pain to get your bike in and out.
 - Generally we find many more of our residents keep their bikes in their units. Secondarily WHEDA requires robust resident storage lockers, which is usually their second preference. I think it's relative to our other buildings.
- Your ground level open area, was there any thought to making that attached to the neighborhood rather than all in one corner of the building for just the residents? You're not doing the neighbors any good with this development.
 - The problem is that double loaded hallways work best so a square building works against trying to make that work. We thought it would also be nice to have space at grade in addition to the rooftop space. Residents don't like to hang out on a busy street so High Street seemed a better place for that.
- With a nanowall your community room could conceivably become an attractive setting with the open space.
- The biggest issue is parking. You've got 58 residents, the data would be more than 10. You've got bike parking that admittedly the residents don't use, you've got a neighborhood that can't handle the overflow and you've got retail in the area with limited parking. Your retail space has no prospect of survival without parking. The building could enjoy more of a setback, achieve more underground parking and help with some of the implications that all these cars are going to have on this tiny little site.
 - No parking is required by zoning.
- It's not required, and a lot of times it's market driven. Just because these people are poor and coming off being homeless, the demand is still the same and the effect on the neighborhood is still the same.
- What is the demand for these sites?
 - Milwaukee, Chicago, Madison as well, we look at this area as having street parking. This is a consistent approach. Just because bike racks aren't being used doesn't mean the residents aren't

using bicycles, they're just putting them in their units. These are folks who have zero income. We've had discussions with SSM and their timelines for redevelopment.

- It sounds like you could provide us with more information on the residents, the likelihood that they're going to have cars, your written agreements with SSM, the viability of the retail with no parking available.
 - It was a preliminary conversation with SSM, we don't have a written agreement.
- A lot of the issues are Plan Commission issues but you can't go to them without our initial approval. With the concerns about parking, setbacks, unusable retail space, to me it's not to a point where I would make a motion for initial approval.
- I understand there's a serious need for this development. I have no issue with materials, you did a nice job with that balance. But when stepping out into the context, it's extremely dense and not knowing what the City is ultimately going to require for the widening of South Park Street, you're building them into a corner.
- Design guidelines don't really address the setback issues.
- More information on the parking demand and how it's being met, encouraging you to look at using some of that retail and bike parking space to either provide more setback or parking, if the information doesn't bear out that there's enough for a reasonable demand in this building. It's possible there isn't a demand for that many spaces.
- Pertaining to the setbacks, the amount I think would appease a lot of people and possibly the City going forward, if the buildings on either side are sometime going to go, why tie them to the front line of this building? More pertinent to me is what's going to happen to Park Street moving forward. I can't believe a little bit more of a setback isn't only going to make each of them a tiny bit smaller.
- We're talking about trade-offs, having meaningful space (like a front porch) on Park Street versus High Street, and a retail space which may end up being a blank sheet of glass. Not saying give up units but redesign the project so that we can get some more of that activity up front on the street.
 - There's nothing along High Street for a good 4-5 blocks in either direction.
 - We don't have that kind of context to consider.
- We can have Traffic Engineering talk about what happens when they reconstruct a street like Park Street.
 - This is the first we've heard about this.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Rosenblum, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** this project. The motion passed on a vote of (5-0).