

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: May 27, 2020

TITLE: 133 E. Lakeside Street – New 5-Story
Mixed-Use Building in UDD No. 1. 13th
Ald. Dist. (60406)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 27, 2020

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 27, 2020, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a new mixed-use building located at 133 E. Lakeside Street in UDD No. 1. Registered and speaking in support was Kevin Burow, representing Knothe & Bruce Architects. Registered in support but not wishing to speak were Chris Armstrong, Scott Kelly, and Karyl Lynn Bruckner. Registered and speaking in opposition were Bob Stone, Elise Kitchel, Michelle Miller, Charlene Sweeney and Jody Clowes. Registered neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak were Carrie Rothburd, Dave Davis, Andy Meessmann, Janelle Munns and Cynthia McCallum. Burow presented the plans, site layout and surrounding context for a 5-story mixed-use building. The building steps back along the western side of the property on both wings, with a rooftop patio area on the northern side at the 5th floor. Two vehicular access points are proposed, with a main drive to the underground parking on the south site along Sayle Street, and a small surface parking lot on the north side off of Lakeside Street, mainly for the commercial space. Two levels of parking are located within the building. Angled parking is proposed on the eastern side of Sayle Street, to provide fire apparatus access to the building, and to provide a safe bike lane along Sayle Street.

Bob Stone spoke in opposition, noting that this is a historic family neighborhood. The traffic flow pattern coming out of here would seriously impact two schools, putting them in significant danger. It's not a good fit for this neighborhood. This isn't the East Washington Avenue corridor, or the Park Street corridor. Primarily this is designed around studios and one bedrooms – that's more young professionals. There are 1-2 story houses here and a few business at 1-2 stories. There are significant problems with water flow, traffic, there weren't good answers by the developers. We have neighbors to the south that are retired, they had no idea about the development going in. They aren't computer savvy and can't participate in these meetings. We asked repeatedly what benefits the neighborhood would get from this – we were chastised that we should sacrifice for the City because we need more housing. Our neighborhood sacrifices for the City already – Willow Island (noise, traffic, people, and garbage), Olin Park, and every fundraising walk that goes through our neighborhood.

Elise Kitchel spoke in opposition, noting that redevelopment of this site would be beneficial but this height is too much next to small family homes. Five stories does not transition well to the 1 and 2-story homes immediately adjacent. This does not match this corridor, would not be visually pleasant to have in this portion of the John Nolen Drive corridor and is not the right size for this site. This does not fit with adjacent buildings, however a shorter building would fit with the Bay Creek Neighborhood and John Nolen corridor.

Andy Meessmann spoke to the character and historic significance of the neighborhood. He showed houses rich in high quality architecture, historically significant buildings, different colors and rich materials, showcased the scale of the proposed building with immediately adjacent architecture and diversity of the neighborhood. The school is one of the largest in the neighborhood. A side by side comparison of the proposed building with the existing architecture shows a stark difference, with no context and relationship of the proposed building to the rest of the neighborhood. This is density without design trying to max out the site.

Michelle Miller spoke in opposition, noting that the massing is out of harmony with the rest of the neighborhood and certainly any house or building near it. This jumps from single family homes to five-stories with a huge massing of people in one small corner of the neighborhood. Sayle Street is a very narrow, short street, it's not even really two blocks, it's one block that has an entry on Lakeside Street and kind of ends at a bike trail that loops around City buildings onto Van Duesen. People going to the Beltline would have to go right in front of the Montessori School or Lakeside, already a problematic intersection. It would become even more dangerous for kids. It's a poor fit because this is a family, middle income neighborhood and this is proposed for high end expensive apartments in small one bedrooms and studios rather than thinking of what the neighborhood needs and has to offer. Please consider some of these poor fit issues.

Charlene Sweeney spoke in opposition as a 30-year homeowner. The street is not that wide and has lots of wires, lights and signals. It's deceiving to show Lakeside Street as that wide and empty. This neighborhood is filled with very modest 1 and 2-story single-family homes. This neighborhood has tolerated a lot of races and beer drinking parties and brat fests, etc. Avante says this will bring vitality to Sayle Street, but they are not taking into consideration the vitality that's already here. Many small streets intersect Olin and Lakeside. Parking is very limited, they have yellow curb markers where you can't park so every block has parking problems. This is significant to me as a senior person who needs people to come to their house, paint their house, mow the lawn; there won't be any place to park. The design is out of character for the neighborhood, starkly modern and dwarfs the modest homes, and the fifth story will block sunlight and views. I would like to see a building no taller than 3 stories with low traffic businesses, landscaping that enhances the beautiful area, respecting the neighborhood's already established homes.

Carrie Rothburd spoke neither in support nor opposition. This isn't zoned properly, it should be NMX. The proposal is too large, too close and too imposing on its neighbors. In conversations with Avante, redevelopment of the Sayle Street City lot is part of a larger vision for this area. In 2002 a study was done that ranked Lakeside Street as a bike and school route Number One in need of traffic calming.

Janelle Munns spoke neither in support nor opposition as the owner of the building right next door. She has spent a lot of money and time to restore that building. All her light would disappear, she'd be looking up at brick. She has planned a small vintage business in a vintage building, but won't have any parking with all these residential units and the commercial space. This will have a big impact on shading on her building and also the other homes around the area. The proposed deck could possibly be a very noisy problem for neighbors.

Dave Davis spoke neither in support nor opposition. He supports the concept of redevelopment of the VFW site, but is opposed to this particular development. The massing does not relate to the adjacent single-family houses. Look at Phase 2 of Sequoia Commons, apartments built on west side of Caromar Drive. They were built at 3-

stories and not stepped back. 120 Lakeside Street wanted to add another story; Planning staff felt that was out of scale and would tower over the single-family residences.

Jody Clowes spoke in opposition, noting that five-stories is out of scale with the neighborhood. As a gardener she has concerns that the building will shade morning light and intrude on her privacy because of the proposed rooftop deck; a substantial fence or screen will be important. There needs to be a way to discourage uninvited visitors to these backyards. Commit to preserving the mature trees in the area.

Cynthia Kaye McCallum spoke neither in support nor opposition. The building as proposed is too tall and does not blend well with adjacent properties. The mature trees need to be kept. This abuts small businesses and small residences. The developer has stated they should be able to build to 5-stories because they are providing amenities and a bus stop. It's debatable whether a business will be an amenity, and the bus stop is already existing on John Nolen. Why is the deck going to invade the nearby residents' privacy when the view on the other side is so spectacular?

The Commission discussed the following:

- Since the UDC is an approving body – this isn't a rezoning or a conditional use. Do we have the authority to build a shorter building if 5-stories is permitted?
- (Firchow) The SE zoning and the TE which they are seeking both have a maximum height of 5-stories. If you're going to make any sort of finding related to height as part of your approval capacity you'd have to base it very specifically on one of the standards in UDD 1.
- Looking at the design I can see a lot of opportunity for improvement. Looking at the pictures of the neighborhood and adding those features into the design would be nice. Right now it's boring. The neighborhood around it is more vibrant, make a better design to include the character of the neighborhood.
- There is no distinction between commercial and residential.
- When this comes back a shadow study will be important to see, considering the height and adjacency of neighbors.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

UDC Informational Review Comments

<p>Site Plan</p>	<p>Acceptable placement of garage entrances so not too much of it is facing streetscape.</p> <p>I like the way this building folds into its footprint. While the five story height might seem a large presence the only really big facade visible to the public is the side facing John Nolen, and it seems like that might be mitigated by the landscaping/Sayle St./ RR median.</p> <p>6 -Parking for commercial space seems inadequate. Is there on-street parking available?</p> <p>Neighborhood has legitimate concerns related to traffic congestion and pedestrian crossing at Lakeside St./Sayles intersection. Stacking on Lakeside at J.N. is already very limited and intersected by RR tracks. Turns into and out of Sayles are frequently difficult now at rush times. Pedestrians walking to bus stop at J.N. & Lakeside have no crosswalk at Sayles and no sidewalk from Sayles east to J.N. bus stop. Given that additional dense residential development is likely on Sayles in the future, the Sayles/Lakeside/J.N. intersection and adjacent circulation and building access all need to be thoroughly examined and rethought. Regarding commercial parking, the developer has stated that the ~50 spaces below the Kelly building would be available in evenings. Daytime street parking on Sayles is currently limited to one side and that side has street sweeping limitations.</p>
<p>Architecture</p>	<p>The first floor entrances look similar to commercial entrances, maybe due to them being full glass and the railings being so open. 5 stories does seem debatable, especially with the higher elements over the commercial entrance where there are void cut-outs in the parapet wall, making it look even taller. 4 stories seems more appropriate. The commercial language continues up above the retail space, making the residences look more like office space. This is a different scale of detail and aesthetic than a lot of the contextual architecture.</p> <p>Nothing that really stands out - pretty standard for these size and type of buildings we see nowadays. Not crazy about the color scheme - clearly the neighborhood has a preference to red/brown masonry as seen in their comments and I would lean towards that myself.</p> <p>6- Residential entry not distinctive enough. Perhaps reserve the wood-looking material for that location. The upper parapets with horizontal slots are arbitrary and unnecessary. Complete west elevation needed to determine how successful design facing residential neighborhood is. Exterior commercial space design should be more identifiable than just signage.</p> <p>Hierarchy of storefront vs punch opening windows is confusing. Consider using storefront at first floor at commercial and main apt entry only, creating a more horizontal element.</p>

	<p>Ground floor entry to apartments could be confused with building entrances. Is there a way to queue these as private using material changes or landscape?</p> <p>When viewed as part of Urban Design District 1, John Nolen Corridor, both the scale and design of this building seem appropriate. The materials – largely masonry and metal panels – are also nice quality. The corner commercial space, however, does not stand out and could be made more visible to J. N. by sweeping the corner with some architectural element.</p> <p>When viewed from the neighborhood perspective, the building seems large and its materials don't echo in any fashion the brick & limestone vernacular of the older commercial cluster four blocks away around Franklin school. More concerning, I think, is the design and proposed uses of the plaza deck above the parking garage and the parts of the other two common decks that face west. Will they be green, how will they be lit, how & when will they be used, will they be screened visually & aurally from the Colby St. neighbors?</p>
Landscape Plan	<p>Hopefully the garage roof is a green roof? If it's a roof terrace, what a shame it doesn't face the opposite way.</p> <p>Not enough to comment at this point - would appreciate lots of streetside plantings esp. along Sayle St.</p> <p>Details not presented. But at least four mature canopy trees will be removed for this project, so the developer should consider future canopy replacement in any landscape plan as well as fortifying green screening to Colby backyards.</p>
Site Amenities/Lighting	<p>More details please on the plaza deck. Is there adequate parking for the commercial business?</p> <p>Unclear how "plaza deck" will be developed.</p> <p>As mentioned, lighting of west-facing decks is a concern.</p>
Signs – if shown, do they complement the architecture? <i>(sign approvals will be a separate application.)</i>	<p>Will a lit sign be requested for the commercial space? We just went through that issue with the Kelly building across the street. Current VFW signage is very modest.</p>
Pedestrian/Vehicle Circulation	<p>Can the traffic into and out of the garage be 1-way to avoid having so many cars turn onto Sayle Street from Lakeside – can traffic enter on Lakeside and exit only onto Sayle?</p> <p>I'm confused as to the entry/exits into the parking garages. Also would expect a close working with the city on issues related to, especially, crossings and possibly new sidewalks. Dickey location for both pedestrians/bikes/ and cars with the busy streets as well as the RR crossing.</p> <p>7 - Interested to understand how deep underground parking can be. Will 1st floor need to be partially elevated? Identify where commercial space/restaurant deliveries and refuse will be. Where do patrons of the future restaurant park?</p> <p>See issues discussed under Site Plan.</p>

Urban Context	<p>Contextual architecture tends to have a recognizable solid base to the structures, separating the first floor from the sidewalk. This new building has glazing down to the sidewalk, and is a more metropolitan aesthetic – may not be the best fit.</p> <p>Appreciate the concerns of the neighborhood re architectural compatibility with the existing homes and small businesses, but I look at this building more in the context of how it fits into this particular location (more J. Nolen than Lakeside St proper) which I think it does fairly well. Certainly visually improvement over the existing.</p> <p>7</p> <p>Overall, the building is a bit stark for this neighborhood. I like the modern look but a small nod or 2 to the eclectic neighborhood nearby? Like the 2902 E. Wash. proposal, this building faces two distinct and different urban contexts. I think it addresses the high-volume John Nolen corridor context successfully, but is less successful and not fully fleshed out in its neighborhood-facing details.</p>
Overall Rating (1-10)*	6.5, 8, 6.5 & 6

*Individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10. The scale is: 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding.