

**Notes from TLNA Steering Committee Meeting on
Stone House Proposal for the 1000 Block E. Washington (eastern half)**

Tuesday, July 17, 2018 at 6:00
The Lyric Conference Room

Attendees:

Madison District 2 Alder Ledell Zellers

Stone House Development – Helen Bradbury, Rich Arneson

Eppstein Uhen Architects - Paul Raisleger

TLNA Council members - Patrick Heck

Neighbors and Interested Parties: Karen Banaszak, Jeff Reinke, Pat Kelly, John Belknap,
Andrea Rieck, Brandy Larson, Shannon Sparks

Welcome and Charge of the Committee

TLNA Development Committee Chair Patrick Heck welcomed attendees. Introductions were made and then Patrick outlined the charge of the committee – to educate TLNA Council about the proposal and to provide analysis that will help the Council take a position should they choose to do so. The City looks to TLNA Council for guidance about how the neighborhood feels about a proposal, so the committee’s work is key. The overall goal is to help the proposal get to a point where it is a win-win for the neighborhood, the developer, and the city. Patrick mentioned that oftentimes the committee does not reach consensus, but instead issues a summary report that details the opinions of all. Typically, the committee does not vote on a level of support, but they can if so desired and can also choose leadership, etc. Membership in recent years has been essentially who shows up – the more voices the better.

Summary of Input from Neighborhood Meeting:

Patrick Heck briefly summarized input/concerns from the June 20 neighborhood meeting for the proposal (some was received electronically after the neighborhood meeting):

UDD-8 ordinance change (or site-specific) – what are the implications?

Ingersoll St. Concerns -

Shadows (and across Mifflin to Lapham)

Elimination of street parking

Traffic backup at stoplight

Traffic increase to “north”

Appearance/street activation of garage side

Massing too large

Too many parking stalls

No TIF for parking structure

Lack of real green space and loss of mature trees

Dog Park possible?

Same/bland architecture as rest of E. Washington corridor

General support for employment and for the townhouses

City Process for this Proposal:

See notes from the June 20 neighborhood meeting for more details on the city approvals that this proposal will need. One important approval will be that of the Urban Design Commission, particularly with respect to the site being in Urban Design District 8 (UDD-8) and following its design regulations. They will need Plan Commission approval of a Conditional Use if the building height is over 5 stories or taller than 68'. On the E. Mifflin side, there is a 3-story height limit and a requirement that the building step up at no more than a 45-degree angle. They are allowed up to 8 stories after meeting that 45-degree step up from the rear - going up to 10 stories if they meet one of several possible criteria for bonus floors. An 11th floor bonus is also possible (see later discussion).

In UDD-8 floor-to-floor height maxima and total building height are based on typical residential buildings – 11' to 15' for the first floors and 9' to 12' for the upper floors. The city will allow an 18' first floor. The site is zoned for employment and office buildings typically have higher floor-to-floor heights than residential, so Stone House will be seeking an ordinance change to allow for taller floors. They will still comply with the maximum height allowed by the FAA – they want about 153' in total height.

Alder Zellers reported that she had met with Heather Stouder, the head of the city's Planning Department on the possible ordinance change concerning the floor-to-floor heights. She has also reached out to Alder Rummel since one option is to change the floor-to-floor heights for all of the commercially zoned parcels in UDD-8, which includes the other side of E. Washington. Ledell noted that this UDD-8-wide change was looked as part of the Summit Credit Union proposal for the same site and it was then noted that not a lot of parcels would be impacted. Heather Stouder is in the process of confirming that. At the time of the Summit proposal, city staff conducted shadow studies on the few parcels it was most likely to impact. The shadows seem to be the most significant in terms of potential impact. One problem Ledell had with changing the ordinance for the whole corridor was that she wanted to be sure it wasn't increasing any negative impacts. In their meeting, Heather Stouder suggested accompanying the ordinance change with a provision that the shadow impact on residences could not be any greater as a result of the change than what it currently is. Ledell believes that because of pushing most of the height to E. Washington in the current proposal, it moderates the shadow impact. So there is potential for an ordinance change and it would likely occur along the same city process timeline as the development proposal. Ledell reminded attendees that she hasn't heard back from Alder Rummel yet, so the approach to any UDD-8-wide ordinance change is TBD. Helen Bradbury from Stone House said that due to the experience with Summit, she thinks they can demonstrate that the shadow condition can be met.

Pat Kelly asked if there was no ordinance change is it true that the proposal would not go through. Helen Bradbury said yes, that was true – the ordinance change was necessary for them to build enough stories for prospective tenants and to make the project financially feasible. The ordinance as written would allow 130' but they need 153', so they would be missing approximately one floor of office space and the 11th floor common area. Patrick Heck asked for clarification concerning the 11th floor and if that was allowable in UDD-8. Ledell answered that a 3rd bonus floor was allowed in UDD-8 if it is a community space and doesn't exceed more than 10% of the square footage of the entire block. Helen indicated that city planning had mentioned a figure of 26% for the square footage – perhaps that was of this parcel only? Helen added that their DAT meeting with the city had not yet taken place, so this would be resolved at the DAT meeting, as well as many other issues. (Note: representatives from many city departments attend

a development proposal's DAT meeting and give initial feedback on requirements and concerns based on submitted plans).

It was mentioned that the surrounding homes and buildings didn't seem to be properly represented on the renderings – many of the nearby structures seem to be not realistically placed or scaled. Paul Raisleger said that these renderings were preliminary and it was early in the process. Realistic data from Google earth were used in the current shadow studies and will be used in future studies (shadow studies are in the neighborhood meeting slides).

Pat Kelly mentioned that in the current Messner site proposal (Gorman) – the focus of their shadow studies is the impact on the nursery school to the rear. She asked if Stone House can include other parties in their evaluation of the shadows and their impact, e.g., the school. She also asked Ledell if any change to the ordinance would just be rubber-stamped by Common Council. Ledell answered that all other ordinance changes have been proposed with her support and TLNA's support and they passed easily. She anticipates the same in this situation, but it is not yet clear exactly what the ordinance changes should be. Karen Banaszak asked about other parcels that would be impacted if the ordinance change is for all of UDD-8 rather than just this parcel. Ledell said that preliminary information indicates that it could impact the parcel that includes Sparkle Autobody and the one that includes the Salvation Army, as well those on the other side of East Washington. She and City Planning will do look at shadow studies for those parcels to make sure any height increases allowed by a district-wide change would not create more shadows on residential structures – she might support an ordinance change that assures that. Also, if it is a site-wide change, she would need to coordinate with Alder Rummel and MNA concerning any impacts there, but she is under the impression that impacts would be minimal due to there being no District 6 residential structures nearby those parcels that would be shadowed. UDC can always consider shadow impacts as proposals go through the process even without regard to the actual ordinance, but it is probably best to minimize the subjectivity. She added that the option for a parcel-specific change is on the table too, but she sees some merit in updating the ordinances for all of UDD-8 since there is a mismatch in them.

A neighbor asked if the parking garage will be like the Summit proposal. Helen said it won't be that big. The Summit proposal included 475 parking stalls and this includes 355 because the demand for parking will be less than with Summit's specific demands.

Proposal Updates:

Helen Bradbury said that much of the architecture in the renderings is not really ready for input because they can't move it further along until they know the ordinance is going to change. They can't invest the money in responding to input about the architecture unless they know an ordinance change is likely to be made.

Helen then showed a revision to the E. Mifflin component of the project (see 2nd developer slide). The rendering is only 2.5 hours old, so it is a brand new concept. They have replaced the townhouses with a new use, partially because of the small depth of the land between the proposed parking structure and E. Mifflin – it is similar to the narrow depths of the condos behind Festival Foods. They have a good tenant who wants a small office building and artist suites – a currently existing Madison arts group. The slide shows just blue blocks as placeholders - they show the required space, but it is very preliminary and those blocks will likely be rearranged and aren't meant to indicate anything other than the required spaces. This usage requires no additional parking stalls. Loading and unloading can be interior but it will mostly be just musical instruments and such. They will have classrooms, rehearsal spaces, and their offices.

It would consist of a non-profit of 3 different groups with a focus on children. There would be about 15 people in their building during the day with more at night when they have small recitals, music lessons, classes, etc. Stone House has discussed with the prospective tenant that the bike boulevard should not be the drop-off/pick-up point due to wanting to keep traffic at a minimum. There would likely be no doors on E. Mifflin – instead access would be interior to the garage with a grand entrance at the building corner near Mifflin and Ingersoll.

It was suggested the changing that block of E. Mifflin to RP3 parking (2-hour limit during the day unless you have a permit) could be helpful. Andrea Rieck said she likes the possibility of RP3 parking. There are a lot of kids playing nearby and crossing the street, particularly with the new families at The Breese across from Lapham School. Helen Bradbury noted that those families now get free parking in the Lyric's garage, so RP3 wouldn't necessarily be a big burden for them. It was noted that a lot of the parkers on this block and nearby are construction workers, downtown state workers, etc., who park all day. The kids can't see the traffic between the parked cars. Pat Kelly noted that the visibility problem will be there whether the parkers have permits or not. There were worries that kids will get hit someday. Helen said that Stone House is working on this issue – there is a fulltime social worker for the families who meets with them twice per week and it has gotten better. Karen Banaszak added that if they had a playground on their grounds, the children wouldn't have to cross the street to play – it would be much better. Andrea suggested a fence to keep the kids from running out in the street mid-block – she's worried one will be hit by a car. She is supportive of no more doors opening right onto Mifflin in the musical arts proposal – more townhouses could have potentially added more children running into the street.

Shannon Sparks asked if the art groups and Lapham School would be cooperating – would Lapham students be using the arts center? Helen said she imagined that would happen. Helen said that the townhouses that were initially proposed were not likely to be 3-bedroom like the lower ones at The Breese. There just isn't enough room given the narrow depth of that portion of the lot, so the townhouses wouldn't necessarily have been full of children. John Belknap asked if the student drop-off area would be on Ingersoll, near the earlier mentioned grand entrance. Helen said no; their intention is for drop-offs to occur in the interior of the parking garage. They have pushed back the grand entrance from Ingersoll to create a visually interesting pedestrian entrance.

The musical arts component is due to a legacy donor, so they want the design and structure to be special and permanent. Other art groups might rent space there too. John asked about trucking – would there be trucks coming and going? Helen said that any loading will be done via the mid-block lane that runs from E. Washington towards Mifflin. That lane, however, ends before reaching Mifflin – you must turn into either the proposed garage or the Lyric's garage. Any trucks would use that and there would likely be a freight elevator on that side. Karen Banaszak reiterated her desire for more green space on the block and she asked why the building needs to take up the entire block. Why can't they put more of the arts center over the parking garage? Helen said that some of it is already over the parking garage in the rendering. Hopefully it will be beautiful and fit into the neighborhood. The proposed uses (classrooms, offices, etc.) dictate the required depth of the rooms – they can't just make them smaller given what the user needs. They did try to move the building back but it impacted the usages. Pat Kelly asked if it would be an all glass building. Helen said not necessarily, the blocks in the rendering are just to represent the sizes, not the end design. It is too soon to say. They are familiar with UDD-8 and will adhere to its requirements. There will likely be texture to the building along E. Mifflin like other

buildings – cutouts and such that give it character. She reminded all that the concept was only a bit more than 2 hours old, so very preliminary.

Pat Kelly asked if it would be busy on weekends or during the week. Helen answered that weekends and evenings would likely be busiest during the school year, but during the summer there could be more daytime users – all based on when kids are not in school. Helen said that there might be some small performance space, but that it TBD. This initial design has small rooftop performance space on the parking garage rooftop – could be used for small donor events, etc., but it is just a concept at this point. Andrea suggested that they have more green space on the garage rooftop. They do plan some of that. It was suggested that some small trees and similar green features could help visually. Pat Kelly said if the building is unique, she'd be proud to show it to visitors. Karen suggested more green on the ground floor in addition to the rooftop. She questioned whether Stone House's prospective tenant really needs this much space – are they adding space just to get more people and more money? Helen said that the building(s) will be hugely expensive to build. They are trying everything they can to soften it. They want it to be smaller, but it has to be so many feet wide to work as an office building. If it were townhouses instead, they would still have to be built close to the sidewalk due to the small depth available.

It was asked how many parking stalls are strictly necessary. Helen said that they don't propose more than they need. If there aren't enough, workers in the new building will park in front of your house – many will drive. There are 220 bike parking stalls in The Lyric and 300 car stalls and it will be similar. The traffic engineering and parking plan that the city requires will mandate that the commercial tenants incentivize bus passes, staggered arrival/departures, etc., and other means of minimizing traffic and parking. She wishes that they didn't have to building parking, but they must. The stalls will be as small as legally allowed.

Karen asked again why they can't push the rear building back - why not push some of it to the west side to make it lower along Ingersoll, maybe on Mifflin too. Can't they make the parking deck taller, thereby reducing its footprint? Helen said if they did that, they won't have enough windows available for the office tenants in either building that would be up against the garage. Karen asked if the tenants had asked for that space. Helen said that corporate tenants are all unique. If a tenant says, "I want 20k square feet on one floor" or "I need x number of offices" or "I must move by this date", then the project is pushed by that. They currently have a deadline for a prospective tenant on E. Washington. Their DAT meeting with the city will probably determine if they can meet the deadline.

Pat Kelly suggested they take the top row of offices/spaces along E. Mifflin and move it back and up one story. Helen said that would make the spaces unusable for their proposed user. Paul Raisleger said that the 30-degree angle requirement (might actually be 45-degree?) prevents the building from going up quickly from Mifflin. Pat suggested that they move the mass back on those upper "blue blocks" as much as they can. She asked how far from the sidewalk the building would start. Paul said 5'. Pat said her front garden is maybe only 8' wide between her sidewalk and her house. If Stone House could have 10' they would have much better landscaping and it would look much more appealing.

Stone House said that the distance between The Lyric/Breese and this proposed development is about 36'. Some thought that moving the grand entrance from Ingersoll to that corner would be better – would create a much more appealing plaza area when combined with the existing open area. Karen said that the cutouts along the Mifflin side should help the feel of the building, but

there should be more room for green space, including between the two developments. Pat Kelly said that she hates the plant choices for The Breese along E. Mifflin. She hopes the area between the buildings will be more simpatico with an art place – native species along the front too. She hopes it will be wild looking. Andrea added that there is potential for walls of draping flowers and other appealing features.

A discussion of the platform shown on top of the garage rooftop ensued. It could be used for performances/outdoor entertaining, but that is TBD. Shannon suggested that the design be changed to a half circle with a roof over the entire area for shade and shelter. John Belknap asked if they would need a permit to have performances there. Helen said that it would be just small children making music, but she's not sure. Would there be amplification? Probably not, but not sure. John said that outdoor performances would be intrusive to nearby neighbors. Andrea agreed, saying her 2 children play trumpet and piano and it is loud. Helen said that there were not likely to be any large shows at this location – it was mostly classes and rehearsals. The bulk of large performances are at downtown venues.

Patrick Heck asked about the screening of the parking structure along Ingersoll. Helen said that the depicted screens are one option, but they haven't done any work on fleshing out the design yet – they can't afford to do that until the ordinance change is on track. Helen suggested that a site-specific ordinance change might be easier and Ledell said that could be possible. Pat Kelly asked why the UDD-8-wide change would be tried. Helen said that the current mismatch between the floor-to-floor heights and the commercial land uses put a burden on all developers, so changing UDD-8 would help, but she also is concerned that the amount of time to do that will delay Stone House to the point that they lose prospective office tenants.

Karen asked about the prospective tenants. Helen said that would need about 60% of the space to be preleased in order for banks to consider financing the project. Ledell asked if Stone House had any other meetings scheduled with city staff other than the July 16 DAT meeting? No, they are waiting for the DAT. Andrea offered her services as a source of landscaping material and even labor for the Breese apartments along Mifflin. She could help put some things in there that are more easily maintained. She can get extra plants, etc., from the County and other sources. Helen said that Stone House has spent a lot of money on the landscaping and she thinks it is working better now. She does want more gardening spaces upstairs next year and there is potential for some help there. Some tenants are growing vegetables, etc., in the rooftop gardens on top of the Lyric parking structure. Rich Arneson added that Stone House can't remove any portion of the landscaping - the city approves everything and they are required to have those landscaping features. Helen said she will investigate though to find out if there is any flexibility

It was asked why they need to use sod – the city requires it. John Belknap asked what happened to driveways that used to be along Mifflin – the city required that they be removed.

Andrea suggested that a mural for the exterior of the parking structure could help make it more interesting – is there a local artist that could paint a mural? A neighbor asked if there would be a loss of parking spaces on Ingersoll – yes, there would be some spaces lost if a right turn lane is put in for turning onto E. Washington. Andrea suggested arborvitae along the garage wall could help, especially since they are green year-round. Karen asked if the parking structure would be open like in the rendering – no, the city requires that it must look like a building. She asked if the parking structure could step back along Ingersoll. How many parking places do they need? Helen said they are required to have one stall per so many square feet and they can take a 10% reduction from that – that is what they propose.

Jeff Reinke asked about the wintertime shadow problems, on Ingersoll especially, that were seen in the Summit Credit Union shadow studies. Helen said that those studies were showing that the shadows were worse because some showed the impact if they built a building as large as allowed currently. Ledell mentioned that the office building has its height along E. Washington and the shadowing impact seems to be less, from what she remembers. Jeff said that he still thinks that the height aspect of the proposal showed a lot of shadowing across Ingersoll to Curtis Court. More discussion of shadows indicated that a more thorough shadowing study would be appreciated – more hours of the day and winter solstice too. Stone House said more studies would be doable once they get an idea of the allowable building massing, etc., after the DAT meeting. It was mentioned that Chris Oddo, a neighborhood architect who participated in the Summit steering committee, had ideas about how tower massing could be pushed to middle of the top of the parking structure.

Next Steps and Meeting:

The group agreed that another meeting shouldn't be scheduled until Stone House has their DAT meeting with the city. It is likely that the outcomes of that meeting will help determine their schedule and the degree to which the proposal might need to evolve/change. Patrick Heck agreed to discuss the outcomes of the DAT meeting with Stone House and Ledell and then schedule the next steering committee meeting. He will notify everyone via email.