

April 27, 2020

TO: PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: ALDER BARBARA HARRINGTON-MCKINNEY

As District 1 Alder, I am very much in alignment with the summary recommendations prepared by the Planning Division Staff. While the developer held a very robust Neighborhood meeting on Thursday, November 21, 2019, (summary notes attached) I was very concerned with the April 13, 2020 Plan Commission meeting when the Summary of the General Development Plan Modifications include Item #2. Removal of Requirement of Ground Floor Commercial on Lots 1, 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the subject property. I am not in support of such removal.

The developer's presentation at the November 21, 2019 Neighborhood meeting did not present the removal of the ground floor commercial lots. The lots would be mixed-use (residential over commercial) and lots 5 and 6 (fronting Mid-Town Road) to be commercial. The applicant is proposing to not provide any commercial space in any of the three buildings. During the Neighborhood meeting the developer discuss the site constraints, sloping and challenges of market viability of commercial uses at this location. The residents were very clear in their desire to have some commercial space in the design. The recommendation of neighborhood-oriented commercial uses is critically important to this prime area of development as the nearest commercial sites are more than 1 ½ miles away. They discussed the empty commercial strip current facing Mid-Town.

As the Alder of District 1, I am not in support of the proposal as submitted at the April 13, 2020 Planning meeting.

1. The proposal is inconsistent with the presentation at the November 21, 2019 Neighborhood meeting.
2. The 2018 Comprehensive Plan recommends Neighborhood Mixed se development for the site which runs along the eastern side of Waldorf: retail, restaurant, services, walkability, access to amenities and services within the neighborhood . The nearest commercial services are miles away and accessible only by car. Currently there is no public transportation scheduled for the area.
3. The removal of commercial uses along Waldorf Boulevard adds additional isolation, traffic, and more sole resident only occupied buildings.
4. Re-consideration of height above Four Stories and Resulting Design Concerns as well green space and more attractive design elements. .
5. The applicant contacted the Alder to push to hold the November 21 Neighborhood meeting which was very successful and well received. Residents were generally supported of the proposed new development. However, the applicant did not inform the Alder of these major revisions in the originally submitted plans, thus neighborhood residents had limited ability for public comment.

Therefore, I am not supportive of this applicant's proposal as presented and I am in agreement with the conclusions of the Planning Commission:

**STAFF CONCLUSION:**

THIIS APPLICATION INCLUDES SEVERAL KEY MODIFICATIONS TO THE EXISTING GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (GDP). THESE INCLUDE: 1) CONSTRUCTION OF THREE INSTEAD OF FIVE BUILDINGS ON THE SUBJECT PARCELS; 2) REMOVAL OF REQUIREMENT OF GROUND FLOOR COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT;

3) INCREASE IN THE BUILDING HEIGHT LIMITS ON THE SUBJECT PARCELS FROM FOUR TO SIX STORIES;  
AND 4) INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF DWELLING UNITS FROM 186 TO 276 DWELLING UNITS.

TO: Planning Commission  
FROM: Alder Harrington-McKinney  
April 27, 2020

Legistar File ID #59635

Madison General Ordinances to amend a Planned Development District properties located at 8110-8134 Mid-Town Road and 1833-1859 Waldrof Blvd, 1<sup>st</sup> Aldermanic District.

#### Neighborhood Meeting

Thursday, November 21, 2019, 7:00 p.m.

Location: King's Kids Academy, 8133 Mansion Hill Avenue

Mailings: over 2000 postcards were mailed to surrounding households informing residents of this meeting. Sign-in Sheets are included in the Legistar file.

Prior to confirming the meeting date, developers were requested to come prepared to give a very detailed presentation as residents attending would be very informed about the area and would come prepared with very specific questions. The presentation by the developers' team was quite impressive, direct, answered questions and was very forthcoming in discussing the project, challenges and considerations.

The notes generated from the neighborhood meeting follows:

1. The project was in early design.
  - a. The apartments would be all market rate housing..
  - b. Mid-Town Road questions
  - c. Widening of Mid-Town Road?
  - d. No setback
2. Traffic Volume
  - a. Will there be a signal?
  - b. Traffic Impact Study? Right-in/Right-out
  - c. Volume of traffic at the bottom of the road?
  - d. What would be the impact to homeowners?
  - e. Who will maintain the road?
  - f. Specifically Waldorf to South Gannon Road
  - g. City will maintain the road up to Marty Road
  - h. Mid-Town is a City Street
3. Any costs to homeowners?
4. Residential/mixed use will be still looked at.
  - a. Suggested small scale.
  - b. 38 unit building?
5. Parking
  - a. Parking stalls – what is the average number of parking spaces
  - b. Concerns expressed about parking

- c. Other apartments currently have 1.4 average parking spaces
  - d. Alternate side parking concerns expressed
  - e. Parking into residential spaces
- 6. Retail space – interested in retail that will do well and not create empty spaces. Detailed discussion of this topic by residents
  - a. Suggestions of types of successful businesses
    - i. Highend restaurant, Colectivo Coffee, Kwik Trip had expressed no interest
    - ii. Possible high-end retail
    - iii. Project carries construction cost of the building. Project success needs an anchor
    - iv. Access to 1 ½ miles down the road
- 7. Discussion on cost of development and construction costs
  - a. Discussion points: affordable rent
  - b. Mixed use retail: what works, what fits and affordable
- 8. J Cape – Who are they?
  - a. Historical background of developer
  - b. Minneapolis, 4 projects in design and construction
- 9. Amenities/no discussion/early in project design
- 10. Building #2 – first buildout
  - a. Roof top/party room
  - b. Social room
  - c. Adult interaction
  - d. Fitness Center
  - e. Building to scale
  - f. Affordable to nice amenities
- 11. Discussion of Vacancy Rates
  - a. Vacancy rates low/affordability/exterior lighting plan too early in design process
  - b. Proposed break ground in May, June, July, August
  - c. 2020-2021 open/ very aggressive time table
- 12. Developers: If they get all their entitlements
  - a. Will stay at 3 buildings
- 13. Density discussion
  - a. 55.9 units per acre
  - b. Building out to the density
  - c. Efficiency/transportation/rent/taxes
- 14. Questions about location/access to construction vehicles
  - a. Staging area off the street
  - b. Construction vehicles will not need to park on the street
- 15. Expressed continued concerns over parking
  - a. Consider adding additional parking
  - b. Continue conversations with City re parking
- 16. Preliminary application will be on-line/planned submission to City/December 11 (idea world?)

17. Second building
  - a. 85% of rented up, stabilized
  - b. Confident to start design of next building
18. Re-Zoning for all 3 buildings –
  - a. Construction documentation/one building
  - b. Very early in the design phase
19. Discussion of storm water runoff/water problems
  - a. Retention basin, underground storm water retention
  - b. 10-year storm event
  - c. 100 year storm event