

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** July 11, 2018

TITLE: 4802 Sheboygan Avenue – PD(GDP),
“Madison Yards at Hill Farms” in UDD
No. 6. 11th Ald. Dist. (48873) **REFERRED:**
REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

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

DATED: July 11, 2018 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Rafeeq Asad, Tom DeChant, Amanda Hall, Cliff Goodhart and Christian Harper.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 11, 2018, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PD(GDP) for “Madison Yards at Hill Farms” located at 4802 Sheboygan Avenue in UDD No. 6. Registered in support of the project were Sean Roberts, representing Summit Smith Development; and Arvina Martin, District 11 Alderperson.

Roberts presented updates to the project in address of the Commission’s previous review, specifically Blocks 2, 3 and 4 and the central green infrastructure.

1. Specificity regarding the parking structure frontage. They have drafted specific language in response to this item that will be added to the zoning text.
2. Materials: Planning staff recommended they look at the existing Zoning Code and the possibility of using the mixed-use/commercial districts. A summary of Table 28.d.1 is included, and they are proposing to use 28.060 Mixed-use and Commercial District material requirements, with the addition high pressure laminate cladding and terra cotta panels.
3. Setbacks and the DOT building. At its closest point the building is 11-feet from the property line, 9-stories straight up with no setbacks. They are proposing to look at Blocks 2 and 3 along University Avenue, with 80% of the lower level facades at the setback line, pulling the buildings back as they get higher. That allows them to maximize the parking density while taking advantage of a very wide right-of-way. From a massing and consistency standpoint they would like to pull the parking podiums outward. Planning staff is comfortable that there is still room to expand University Avenue if needed in the future. They also provided context continuing east on University Avenue; Target has a similar scenario where the façade of the building is 20-feet from back of curb, they feel they’re consistent with the commercial character and the neighboring PD.
4. The 20% exemption and setback written into their zoning text to allow for some articulation was of concern to Planning staff. They have since removed that from their zoning text.

5. The non-occupiable architectural features that encroach between private lots. The code is written to allow specific things such as awnings to encroach within setback areas. They are asking for, within the development, to have the ability to expand beyond awnings to include sun shades or fins or other architectural features that would encroach between private parcels. They want the buildings to have a unique character and be able to add those architectural features. This does not include balconies.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- It looks like the Council has acted on this?
 - Yes.
- So what action can we take that would make any difference at this point?
 - I don't think they acted on the encroachment or architectural features.
- (Firchow) If you look at the approval letter, there were five items specified that the UDC requested come back. There's nothing counter to those in terms of the action the Council took. The approval letter is in your packets. I would recommend sticking with those five items you previously flagged.
- We can comment on those items but they're not going to change regardless?
 - (Firchow) No, you're advisory but also an approving body because this is in an Urban Design District.
- On Item No. 1, the language about the exposed parking structures. "Above ground parking structures shall be located in the center of the lot to the greatest extent possible." I would suggest removing "to the greatest extent possible," and when you come back for the SIP, you can say it's located in the center of the block and ask for approval of whatever is not in the center of the block as part of the SIP versus this vague language "to the greatest extent possible." Further down where it says "any structured parking proposed on the perimeter of Blocks 1-5 shall be fully integrated, especially Blocks 2 and 5." Again I would just take out Blocks 2 and 5 and leave it as a general goal for all lots. The last sentence that says "any structured parking located at the perimeter of the project abutting public streets shall be fully enclosed from an architectural perspective and shall include materials and windows designed in a fashion as to appear as little as parking as possible. I would suggest changing "include materials and windows" to just say and "shall be integrated in the overall building design." It would give your designers more latitude to screen the parking without making it look like fake window openings.
 - Some of these mega blocks, one of our big concerns is that there will be big portions where it'll be impossible to have it completely screened. If we took out the language of "center of the block" that puts us in a conflict already. At least there's a reference that it may not be feasible.
 - (Firchow) I do think one of the items, because this was tied specifically to the zoning text and that's under the jurisdiction of the Council, it would be appropriate for UDC to provide comments as far as guidance when the SIP comes in, but the UDC is not in the position of changing the zoning text.
- The zoning text is all we have before us.
- We seem to have heard different things as far as what is subject to our review and what is not.
- (Firchow) As I understand it, the zoning text was approved by the Common Council with, in some cases, very specific language.
- This language was approved by the Council, so we cannot change it.
- (Firchow) Correct.
- The issue of tweaking of what percentage of lineal footage exposed parking becomes moot and replaced by this language. We can still calculate the lineal footage, but in terms of adding anything, we can't really do that. In essence this language from staff that was adopted by the Council wiped out anything else.
- Yes.

- The setback, even if they need to expand the street in any way, the concern is not the driving aisle to the building but the pedestrian? How close to traffic are you putting pedestrians on that road?
 - As context we would be able to maintain that. One of the things we'll be doing is expanding the sidewalk to 8-feet. If University were to be widened we still have the green areas and sidewalk and still have space to get that 80% of the façade. At the SIP level you'll tie up the final designs. And we'll have vision triangles.
- Isn't University Avenue designated as a test site for BRT? Is there any discussion to adding additional lanes to University Avenue for that?
 - (Firchow) The BRT studies are still just studies, but I'm not aware of any additional lanes at this point. It would drive around this site as the current study shows.
 - (Roberts) One of the things we've done to dedicate that area to the City as well as pulling in Sheboygan a few feet to accommodate that.
- Anybody have any concerns about the materials, adding those two? And the encroachment of architectural features?
 - No.
- (Firchow) The language specified in the approval letter are locked down, but there are things that are still under the UDC's purview but the text adopted by the Common Council couldn't be revised by this body.
- Last time we saw this we granted conditional approval?
- The conditions we granted on initial approval have since been overruled and voted on by the Common Council on the recommendation of staff, so that's where we are. But there's still a couple things here we can approve. It's the way the process worked.
- We can approve 2-5 and ignore 1?
- We have to grant final approval.
- (Firchow) The Common Council action did specify before permits are granted this body has to grant final approval.
- If we don't grant final approval at this stage, then what?
 - We can't record our GDP and come back for the SIP.
- We're still approving a couple things, the architectural materials, and what's already been approved by the Council, the architectural features, the setbacks.
- Would it be a motion for final approval on Items 2-5 with the concerns of how Item 1 is...does it even matter?
- No.
- (Firchow) I think you can note as a signal to the developer of what you're expecting when they come back for the SIP. That would be appropriate.

ACTION:

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** on Items 1-5. The motion passed on a vote of (6-0).