

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** October 16, 2019

TITLE: 630 E. Washington Avenue - **REFERRED:**
 Redevelopment of the Salvation Army **REREFERRED:**
 Campus to Include Homeless Shelter with **REPORTED BACK:**
 Support Services, Apartment Complex and
 Underground Parking in UDD No. 8. 2nd
 Ald. Dist. (56474)

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

DATED: October 16, 2019 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Shane Bernau, Tom DeChant, Christian Harper, Craig Weisensel and Syed Abbas.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 16, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of redevelopment of the Salvation Army Campus located at 630 E. Washington Avenue in UDD No. 8. Registered in support of the project were Major Andrew Shiels, Tara Barica, Jim Pope and Marc Ott, all representing The Salvation Army; Leah Teske, representing JLA Architects; Marilyn Feil, representing Affordable Housing Action Alliance; Patty Prime and Al C. Schultz. Registered and speaking in opposition were Kyle Ripple, Tim Kubichek and Nataliya Knudson. Registered neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak was Robert Klebba. The Salvation Army has been in Dane County for 130 years, and this location since 1977. The goal is to provide a more purpose-built facility to help address issues of the shelter and affordable housing, helping individuals make an improvement in their lives. They offer emergency shelter housing programs, medical, dental and mental health services, and a safe dignified place to help people get back on their feet.

Teske reviewed the site layout, programming and the location of program elements, with the main entrance being on N. Blount Street. The project includes a shelter building along E. Washington Avenue with a gymnasium and courtyard, and a three-story apartment building parallel to E. Mifflin Street that will offer mixed-income units. The shelter and apartment building will have entries through the courtyard and gym, as well as on the street. The E. Washington Avenue façade has been broken into three components on the corners and middle of the building to create a rhythm using a rich material palette of metal panel, composite panel, glass and masonry. Utility brick masonry and burnished block will run along the base level, and a wood accent and composite panel are proposed as an accent to warm up the exterior. Glass is used to allow views in and out of the common spaces and for security purposes. The mechanicals have been stepped back 15-feet to comply with UDD No. 8, refuse and service areas are set back off the street on N. Blount Street. The gym view shows the same materials as the rest of the shelter, as well as the introduction of colored glazing. The 3-story apartment building will also use the same materials, in addition to hardi plank and wood accents. The first floor along E. Mifflin Street will have walk-ups to the first floor units and a small porch area with a sun shade or canopy. Views showed a secure play area for children.

Public Comment

Robert Klebba registered neither in support nor opposition. He has been working with the Salvation Army to address problems and feels like a lot of them have been addressed. Many of the current issues are facilitated by open parking areas in the back of the facility along E. Mifflin Street. As neighbors they have been working to better integrate this facility into the neighborhood. The design and placement of buildings needs to maximize security for guests and neighbors. This development should have minimal impact on the neighborhood from a noise perspective, he requested all mechanicals be placed on the roof of the building and that there be no walpaks. He further asked that underground ventilation not face adjacent residences and be designed for quietness. We need to be comfortable as a community that we are designing for security here. Please look at how this building has security features designed into it and make sure they are adequate for what has been experienced and what they will have going forward.

Tim Kubichek spoke in opposition as a resident of Dayton Row. He personally does not feel that issues have been addressed and has called the Police Department numerous times in the last three months. He has emailed his Alder and spoken to Major Greg to no avail. This design does nothing to help fighting directly in front of his condominium. There are places to congregate and hang out and it's a problem. Conversations about security and safety have been going on for the last ten years, but the Salvation Army says it's not their problem to deal with because it's on the street. To say the neighborhood hasn't seen these issues is flat out wrong. This design is absurd, especially the open area. Box it off, put everything onto E. Washington Avenue so it's not impacting the neighborhood.

Patty Prime spoke in support of the project. She has met with the Salvation Army and the Police several times per year in the past many years to open the lines of communication. Currently a lot of families are turned away each night; this design eliminates some problems but does not fix everything. The open parking lots have been a huge problem and the new plan makes a big difference. They are proposing operational changes to their security. There are a lot of spaces in the building for people to hang out. Sending people away every night because they don't have the capacity doesn't fix anything. The current building design has few windows, it's dark, has a small waiting area, and this proposal vastly improves visibility and makes a wholesale difference in attitude. She would love to see a process set up between the neighborhood, the Salvation Army and the City to regularly take a look at how things are working.

Nataliya Knudson spoke in opposition as a direct neighbor. When she purchased the condo it was not intimidating, but now after living there for 3 ½ years it is not a good situation. She spoke about people drinking, fighting, screaming, blocking traffic, doing drugs, and police cars. This neighborhood has become a hub for homeless, mentally ill people. The Salvation Army doesn't have funding for proper security, but has funding to build a new chapel, when you can walk five minutes from here and find several churches. They do not deserve to be able to redevelop their campus because they cannot control their current one. She also expressed concerns for stormwater management and other environmental impacts.

Al Schultz spoke as a nearby resident who thinks the Salvation Army has been a good partner to this development. The courtyard design will help keep people on the campus and off the street. The mixed-income apartments mesh well with the condominium next door; having that mixed-income barrier will help keep problems contained. It will help welcome all income groups to the neighborhood and keep problematic behavior of the neighborhood.

Kyle Ripple spoke in opposition as a resident of Dayton Row. He is a new neighbor who was aware of the Salvation Army being here and supports diversity in his neighborhood. But living here, his quality of life has decreased tremendously. People do not feel safe walking the neighborhood. His biggest issue with this

expansion is the expansion: they are doubling the number of people served. Bringing more people into the neighborhood is only going to compound the issues. It takes time and trust to be built between Salvation Army and the neighborhood; building metrics to share ideas and see if they are working. He has little faith that this project is going to fix these problems. He attended all of the TLNA steering committee meetings; that council decided to not take a stance at all on this project, which is a disservice to all who attended those meetings and the residents in that neighborhood. In that report, a majority of the people in the neighborhood are against the project, as are a majority of people who have sent in letters and emails. That should be listened to. This project is not supported.

Marilyn Feil spoke, representing Affordable Housing Action Alliance. She used to work at the Salvation Army in the 1990s when they did the first remodel and is familiar with the building. The idea of having a space for kids to play at night and not being out in the parking lot, having a place for families to be outside makes a lot of sense. It is an old school building that needs updating and expansion. She had to tell a lot of families they didn't have room for them to stay there. She hopes there is a way for the community and the Salvation Army to come to some kind of agreement. The AHAA supports the expansion and there being some transitional housing or more permanent housing connected to it.

The Commission discussed the following:

- We heard a number of comments about security. Please go over elements of the building that enhance security.
 - The existing layout shows the 2-story building surrounded by mostly parking lots. The capacity, visitors coming and people being turned away all contribute to that. The initial design was trying to stay on the existing property, but there are legalities for them surrounding activity off their property. They made the investment to gain control of the remainder of the parking lots as step one. Increasing the occupancy helps keep people off the street. There is really nothing much to do in the current building other than sleep, so they go outside while they wait for curfew. Turning the entrance and providing more glass brings that internal and creates more visibility out to the parking lot. Giving them something to do inside will help keep them off the street. They will have computer labs, eating areas, the gym, and a large lobby to avoid queuing outside. Every floor is a different use by different groups; the Salvation Army only serves single women and families. Security through design.
- When somebody is coming, how do they get to that underground parking, with a key card? When they're queuing up where are the cars waiting before they can park?
 - The parking is still being worked out, but it will be controlled. It will probably initially happen in the parking lot. Both lots will have gate access controls because there is a curfew. The new lobby is substantially larger so people can queue inside rather than wait on the street. The intent is to bring them in during the check-in process.
 - A one-bedroom could have no more than two individuals, potentially three if one of them is a child under the age of two. They will have access to the playground and a number of the resources in the first floor of the shelter.
- Is there a possibility of having the first floor units face the courtyard with some outdoor space?
 - We could look at that.
- You'll probably have pretty substantial security lighting. Make sure it's effective but not directed at your neighbors. The entrance to the Mifflin common entry doesn't look like it has much of a definition different than the other private entrances. There's no other queuing that it's a public entrance.
- What's the HVAC system?

- It's our plan to have all the mechanical systems on the roof and shield them. The apartments will have individual HVAC systems, we're proposing furnaces so no venting through the wall. We haven't gotten into the basement/parking venting yet.
- What's the number of units and the mix?
 - Seven of them will be market rate, the rest on a scale. Twelve of them at the subsidized level and pre-furnished. 60% on down to 30%.
- Why is the setback for the apartments larger than required, because it makes for more unusable space? Why not push it closer to the street? You could increase the courtyard.
 - We're playing with the grade and wanted the walk-ups. Since we made the steps parallel to we're going to pull it back closer to the street. That gives more area in the back.
- Depending on how you do that you could make the stairs more hidden so it's not so inviting to others.
- On the elevation along E. Washington, I'm concerned because that looks like your top elevation but when you read it from the street it seems separated.
 - That angle portion is the mechanical screen. As part of the requirements of the setback we had to pull it forward but to meet the UDD guidelines we'll have to push it back.
- Be consistent with the coping or branding along the top. On that same elevation there's a lot of vertical glass, then horizontal glass. It's separate from your entry which is strong, but why horizontal on the corner?
 - We wanted to introduce the accent composite siding to help warm up the corner. We do pull it down into verticals so it was an interest in not making it as glassy but not super heavy. Allowing the entrance to be something unique on its own.
- The rest is simple and elegant and I'm concerned you're adding more to it. And have continuity to the other corner all the way around.
- There's a requirement for double rows of trees along E. Washington Avenue, it looks like you're mostly hitting that with the landscape plan. Is there a reason there isn't one at the parking lot island?
 - We can add that there.
- The species selection is intentionally low or tall and not middle, that looks good. One exception was the Witch Hazel in the back corner near the ramp, there are only two of them, they would be easy to swap out. Is the access to the playground strictly from inside?
 - Yes, and it's fenced at 5-feet.
- Are the street trees on Blount new or replacements?
 - I'm not sure about Blount, but the street trees are very significant along E. Washington. There are some on Blount but I don't know if they're as mature. It is our intent to protect them during construction, but we might lose one or two for the new drive.
- The corner perspective of Mifflin and Blount, the little cap that projects off the corner is mirroring the larger big brother, but to me it feels weird and out of place. Where it's important to convey timelessness that reads awkward.
 - We're split on that element ourselves. We're open to suggestions.
- It has sort of a stuck on element. It's not offensive as much as it seems a little out of place.
- It's a single element, it doesn't tie in.
- Can you speak to what you're doing for run off, particularly with the surface parking lots? Have you considered permeable pavers?
 - We recognize that the Isthmus has water issues. Under the building we will have a permanent de-watering system with redundant back-up systems. Right now we're projected to have underground storage tanks for roof water. We're definitely open to permeable pavement, and we're looking at blue water roofs. It's a series of solutions. I'd like to think that being held to all the modern standards, we really are trying to look at make this a LEED building, fundraising is part of the issue. It will definitely be improved from what is there now.

- The notion of underground parking here given what I've personally seen and driven through here is scary, I'm glad to hear you're taking that into consideration and building in redundancy. I still have some issues but it sounds like you're on the right track.
- The issue of those entrances to the apartment building on Mifflin Street, with those open steps or stoops, in certain places that would be wonderful but in this neighborhood, given the problems, I'm not sure giving people a place to sit and take up space is something you should be doing. Sometimes these things have gates (i.e. New York or Chicago) but it says this isn't for someone walking down the street to be using. It may address some of the neighbors' concerns if it wasn't so wide open.
- What is the rationale behind the open stairs?
 - Stormwater management, we pulled the building up out the ground to meet elevation requirements. As we did that and in looking what's been down on Mifflin, they all have gates on their walk-outs. Seeing how we can tie the character into the neighborhood more. We thought direct access and the architectural style would fit in well.
- With the safety concerns, it might be better to move the entrance to the other side of the building. These big walls, we want to make sure it's more visible for safety concerns. The entries could be moved to the other side of the building.
 - We're open to that suggestion.
- The overhangs, the smaller building takes over entirely and has zero purpose. The other seems overly obtrusive, so large. I don't understand the point of the louvers and what's underneath because you're going to get some massive icicles having off those.
 - It's a design choice.
- It may look better with a more generous overhang but not that far.
- We've had this conversation before of affordable housing, materials and details, and not to look like affordable housing. People are more respectful in places that respect them. Look at the quality of the materials going on the building, how they're detailed and how they go together.
- Stripping all of that articulation of the façade out of there and making it look institutional would be to the detriment of the project. I fear that by stripping out that nice breakdown and massing along the rest of Mifflin, this building now takes on this identity that you don't want it to have. I think everyone in the room can acknowledge that we're dealing with some tricky issues. I would be careful to not take too much of that nice character out of the façade.
- Perhaps tricky issues require some extraordinary solutions. Just to remind the Commission in our motion we should, as requested by staff, have a finding whether or not the project is in compliance with UDD No. 8 standards. The request is initial, which is basically building mass, site plan and materials. If you find the project is initially approvable, that means those design elements are fine the way they are. Also try to be specific on what you'd like to see from them next time.
- (Firchow) I believe the parking lot setbacks have been met now.

A motion was made by DeChant, seconded by Weisensel, to grant initial approval. Discussion continued as follows.

- The neighbors who are concerned about the expanded services, I think within your site, how people move through the site, I still don't understand your hours of operation for when spill and people are not allowed on the site, the flow outside of the site. We restrain from making comments that don't involve the building site on projects, but so many public comments have been about how clients and people living there queue in and out of the site and how you handle that. Operational information that's not on the site about flow and stacking, hours of operation and other security operations.
- I heard promises of considering blue roof, LEED certification.
- The double row of street trees is something I'd like to see follow-up on.

- Please look for programs run by the State on energy efficiency in building codes.
 - We are working with Focus on Energy and will be 100% committed to being Wisconsin green built at a minimum.
- The staff report #1, the height and setback along E. Washington, do we think that has been addressed?
- I believe what we're seeing on the screen, not what's in your packet, is updated.

ACTION:

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Abbas, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). Proceed to Plan Commission with recommendations of orientation of Mifflin street entries, operations, and scaling back trellis overhangs.

Conditions of Initial Approval for updated plans (10/16/19):

- Confirmation that adjusted penthouse level meets 15' setback.
- Confirmation that E. Mifflin Street meets the 20' maximum setback.
- Confirmation that the parking lot meets setback requirements.
- Respond to comments regarding the orientation of Mifflin Street walk-up entries, consider adding a gate and/or orienting them toward the courtyard. Keep "The Shield" apartment entry on E. Mifflin Street and carefully consider how to articulate the exterior elevation if the walk-up entries are moved.
- Provide more detail on building operational information, i.e. how people move through the site, hours of operation, where people wait to be accepted, where people go if not allowed on site, how people flow through the site, parking entrance queuing, etc.
- Eliminate smaller roof trellis detail on E. Mifflin Street and scale back the trellis overhang on E. Washington Avenue penthouse element.

Considerations and requested information for Final Approval:

- Stormwater – more detail on how it is being addressed i.e. pervious pavers, etc.
- Provide information on all existing and proposed trees, including street trees. Work with City Forestry on E. Washington Avenue, Blount Street and E. Mifflin Street terraces.
- Bring samples of exterior building materials. Provide quality materials that are well detailed and don't look like affordable housing.
- Study window patterns/configurations, corner vs. street elevation, continuity of glazing.
- Provide more detail on E. Washington Avenue elevation top of roof condition where the white metal panel stops at the top. Consider coping or banding detail.
- Provide more detail on sustainability measures, programs, i.e. Green Built Wisconsin, etc.
- Landscaping – replace Witch Hazel plan with other native planting.
- Confirm that the garage ventilation is not facing towards houses.