

**East Washington Avenue BUILD
Capitol Gateway Corridor Land Use and Urban Design Plan
Public Meeting # 2**

Meeting Minutes

Approved 11/28/05

Tuesday, Nov. 17th, 2005, 5:00-8:00 pm (snacks and beverages provided)

945 E. Washington Ave

Meeting Chair: Bob Horowitz Meeting Facilitator: Rebecca Krantz

Notetaker: P. Hathaway

Purpose of meeting: To present committee's work so far to wider public and get input.
Attendance: 81 people attended including committee members, staff and consultants.
Summary of input received is here. More detailed notes are below. Transcriptions of flip-charts and comment forms are attached.

Public Input Summary

(numbers in parentheses are number of mentions – in some cases could be one person who mentioned it once during the meeting and once on comment form)

Likes

Principles & Uses:

- Attempt to harmonize with/respect existing neighborhoods (4)
- Mix of land uses (3)
- Renewal of the area, residences supported by more businesses (3)
- Support for transit (2)
- Focus on employment (3)

Bulk standards:

- Limit of 3 stories on E. Mifflin is good (1)
- Like height/setback requirements, support increasing density. (3)
- Envelope for developers with latitude within/flexibility of standards (2)
- Attempt to formulate guidelines/ordinance instead of fighting battles over & over (1)
- Green standards (1)

Changes/Concerns

Transportation issues:

- Congestion, increasing traffic with increasing density (2)
- More discussion needed of parking, impact on streetscape, green roofs (3)
- Pedestrian underpasses under E. Wash (1)
- Strengthen provisions that encourage alternatives to car travel (2)
- Fiore shopping area should be multi-modal transit park & ride area plus commercial space for commuters to shop (1)
- Connections across E. Wash difficult for pedestrians (2)
- E. Main should be lively, not rear side of development, not dominated by parking; E Main should be pedestrian focus (4)

Environmental issues:

- Flooding/storm water management (1)
- Strengthen green development principle (1)
- Concern about soil contamination/brown fields (1)
- Add guidelines to protect sky from light pollution (1)
- Trees/landscaping desired (2)

Housing issues:

- Need family-friendly housing to keep schools & neighborhoods (1)
- Add language encouraging affordable housing (1)
- Focus on live/work or live near work (1)
- Show existing houses at First St. just outside of study area on plan (1)

Commercial uses:

- Don't preclude some larger retail uses – good complement to primarily employment area (1)
- Concern about wording of Core Principle #2, destination, need to protect existing business districts – Johnson, Willy (1)

Bulk Standards:

- Overall massing should be limited (3) [Tall OK, massive not/more provisions to prevent envelopes built to maximum/ Avoid “canyonization” like on Gorham/University campus area]
- Use density bonuses to achieve goals & vary skyline (1)
- Concern about differing heights on N vs. S. side, imbalance in frame of Capitol (1)
- No mandatory setbacks/step backs/facades, need diversity, surprise/excitement, not monotony (3)
- Concern about chaotic look with step backs/facades in plan (1)
- Setbacks maximum 10', larger is waste of space (1)
- Step backs on E. Mifflin too small (1)
- Height limits in draft plan are too high (4) [10 stories, 6 stories on N side, ERC plan all mentioned as more appropriate limits]
- Height limits in draft plan are good or even too low in places (5) [ERC heights are too low; Increase height limit from Baldwin to River/Allow higher heights/decide individual projects in context/ no max height limits]

Architectural design:

- Architectural features should be in harmony with existing buildings (1)
- We don't want harmony with existing, existing conditions are ugly, want fun/interesting (1)

Public input/ process:

- View this as a preliminary plan, UDC & Plan Commission will make final decisions (1)
- Need more future input/3-dimensional modeling/more input from south of avenue (3)
- Shouldn't overturn ERC Plan, will make this plan less meaningful also (2).

More detailed meeting notes

1. 5:00 Doors Open, Viewing of Displays in Self Guided Tour

Handout as guide for the boards up around the main room.

2. 5:30 Presentation to Public from Lead Planning Consultants Vandewalle & Associates

Committee has had 10 meetings

What is being presented is a work in progress

BUILD is a funding program to control sprawl from County.

Context corridor fits in: in middle of neighborhoods and past planning efforts. First plan to look at EWA corridor (Main to Mifflin) as a singular entity.

Analysis transportation linkages.

March 30th Public Meeting with smaller groups.

Committee took input from public and various documents.

Regional context is important to corridor as well as neighborhood.

Uses identified

Techniques to achieve the core principles (Implementation techniques)

Core development principles:

- I. Protect and enhance the iconic view of the capitol
- II. Respect and strengthen existing neighborhoods
- III. Firmly establish the corridor as an employment center supported by transit
- IV. Create an inviting vibrant boulevard along east Washington Avenue

Transportation is key component of everything.

Parking Structure: 300 cars /1,000 people

100' x 180' footprint

6 parking decks

Office Building

100,000 sq. ft

100'x125' footprint

8 stories

Options to reduce pressure and need for large parking structures include:

Shared Parking

Parking Cash out

Transit Opportunities

Live/Work relationship

Community Car

Bulk Standards and Future Land Use Map is in the handout.

3. Comments from BUILD Committee Chair - Bob Horowitz

Representative examples of what the committee has determined should be the outer limits. He went over in detail Cross Sections #1-4.

Explained options for contributing input (speak at this meeting, submit comment form, e-mail or send them)

Rebecca Krantz - Work of committee on website is also available in printed form at Williamson Street Cooperative and Downtown Library, courtesy of Anya First, volunteering her time to compile these.

4. Comments and Discussion, beginning with Clarifying Questions

E-mail confirmation? Send comments to einpc@tds.net or mgay@cityofmadison.com

Steve Steinhoff - Landscaping Standards? A: principles mention that there will be standards but does not specify them yet

- Adjacent to Burr Jones Field – what will go there? Scott – City Comp Plan zones it as mixed use. Lives in one of corner homes, wants to know what implications there could be.
- What about eminent domain? Existing buildings? A: not planned to be used here. Existing buildings will not need to be reconfigured to meet these guidelines, it's just for new development
 - What is the process of making an ordinance? A: Committee will work on some, then to UDC, Common Council.
 - Numbers of housing unit that will be added? Parking, Condos? #s? Scott H. – no, “Build-out analysis” not yet been done.
 - Amount of buildings and affect of water? Where is all the water going/how is will it be handled? Flooding problems. Scott H. - Storm drainage would not necessarily increase since there won't be necessarily more impermeable surface.
 - Plans to have water draining gardens? Scott H. Smart building green building to minimize impact on the environment (see under principle four).
 - Regulations? What mechanisms are made to encourage or require taking alternative transportation. Principle four deals with transportation issues. Catherine Debo of Metro is on the committee. Also see transportation section. Stated as key issue, no requirements per se.
 - Ted Voth – concerned for pedestrians; making it pedestrian friendly. Bob H. New buildings will be set back from the lot line and that there be landscaping within that setback such as trees.
- TV – thinking more of crossing EWA. Scott H. – addressed by committee – guidelines/techniques are listed for getting to EWA and across. Covered in core principles #2 and #7. Bob H. – don't have answers yet, not specific.
- Rebecca K. – getting off clarifying questions, want to merge into comments?
- Bob – take more clarifying questions first
- What about diverting pedestrian friendliness to Main Street, as it is not achievable goal – think about Main Street as a more congregating area vs. EWA.
 - How can we determine that maximum build-out won't happen? What can go in 'outer envelope'?
 - Where would Archipelago Village be, on this map? Which block? - Answer - across from Breese Stevens.
 - Mike Barrett – Resident, on Urban Design Commission – though speaking for himself, expresses overly restrictive height restrictions, hoping that can have a range of heights, neighborhoods in city that have used range to their advantage – hopes to get flexibility. Support of transportation suggestions, likes the shrinking parking ramp visual, hopes we plan for development to be living in the place, whether it is live work or just living close to work. Economic development.
 - Urban Design Commission – all plans should be viewed as preliminary.
- Bulk standards not be too restrictive – variation along corridor – unlikely – should be able to encourage people who are going to take risk to develop here, should have latitude and creativity.
- when do restrictions on height get made? When in the process will heights get decided? Bob H. – when ordinance gets made, min and max will take place.
 - commercial/industrial use in this area for a long time, what about soil issues and reclamation? City responsibility? Developers? This was all a dump. Methane? Mark O. – know there

- are issues in corridor, had discussions with stakeholders, City has grant to provide Brownfield loan program, TIF could be used, varies from project to project.
- Octopus cost over 1 million dollars, did not address seepage.
 - A Lot of truck use on EWA, with diesel dripping, what about that? Bob H. – this has not been addressed.
 - Rebecca K. – would developers like to address? No
 - Rebecca K. – heights – woman with comment before – particular concerns?
 - quality of life concerns, sunlight, ranges, what is happening? Are buildings planned to be so tall?
 - RK – sunlight issues on E. Mifflin have been discussed, and to be addressed with step downs.
 - Condos on John Nolen, large for Madison, not necessarily disagreeing
 - 18 stories, 15 stories, will benefit the contractor and the property owner, but 99% of the people aren't going to be helped by such a large building – will just contribute to pollution – 1,000s of cars will be brought in – 300 condos will have cars. 18 story building will not help.
 - Peter Wolff – Marquette NA been involved with traffic for a long time. Other neighborhoods are also trying to make neighborhoods with less traffic by diverting to EWA. Density volume will create huge push on EWA. Our neighborhoods are important – historical and family school reasons.
 - 18 story building – I don't know – ways to mitigate sprawl – if we want to see development happen here, needs more density with larger heights and larger foot prints. If we truly want to stop seeing farm land being eaten up, we have to build densely.
 - When high buildings are built – what is the limit in there?
 - Nancy Sloan/S. Few Street resident – prefers 10 story height max with family oriented housing – to keep schools – to keep neighborhoods. Would like to see a lot of trees on both sides and up the blvd. to improve the city and neighborhoods in a relatively inexpensive way.
 - Ted V. – resident of Marquette – too dense will lose neighborhood feel – going up and down the street, know a lot of people
 - Marquette resident for 35 years – has to be increase of height – and preserve neighborhoods – but like Gorham downtown/campus – suffocating – this is concern – developers maximizing space for profit
 - David W – Tenney Lapham rep on committee – height is huge issue for this area – recently went through process for Don Miller property with developer Gorman and Company – lives in design area – part of the Gorman project was learning and working together – to both prevent sprawl and preserve neighborhood. Housing for families was important. When we started we said “no more than 6!” When we worked with the specific blocks and situation, we came to 10 stories with one tower and also some smaller ones – to be able to still see sky, have green space, and get the density we need.
 - about everything that has been talked about so far – has there been thought about taking areas for parking from going up to going down? To have at the level of the street to be green space. Breese Stevens field and Burr Jones, only green space.
 - Hard time getting heads around the heights, hard to see beyond one's own area – hard to know what 15 stories means – 3 D models? Shade studies? What tools in your budget are you using? Mark O. – profile section slides – models? When this process is done-would like to do that? Had staff go out and look at the square. Some 10, 2, 5, 7 story buildings.

What we need to think about as area evolves, there won't be monolithic look. Challenge is to make it with character.

- models: 3 D? physical?
- I put model of the Capitol out on the lake every year
- Al – still won't fit within zoning codes; will need to be neighborhood review process still for most projects, this just creates guidelines
- Question on guideline 2, destination, what will protect existing streets, Willy St, E. Johnson (business districts?)
- Don't just respect existing neighborhoods, but fit into them, since they are part of the study area. Should be gradient of heights, from lakes to e. wash, taller on e. wash. Concerned about aesthetic/visual disconnect between E. Wash & rest of neighborhood if large jump in height; 5 stories on E. Wash in plan, with gradient from Capitol to river. Urban sprawl needs to be addressed through something like Attain Dane, not building heights and densities.
- live in Emerson East neighborhood. Walked here to get a sense of it. Concerned about traffic, as a pedestrian. Walking down EWA is a wind tunnel, busy traffic, snow. What makes sense to me is having a few places for crossing, with borders. Makes sense to have more neighborly action facing in to the neighborhood.
- Marsha R. Vice Chair of BUILD committee, and Marquette neighborhood association president – wants to hear from you if 8 stories is good, or not – will be a process – committee voted on some things at the last meeting, including heights on S. side of EWA to be higher than East Rail Corridor plan already established.
- Density is not a panacea to address urban sprawl nor boogey man for neighborhoods, in this study, there have been attempts to put density where it is appropriate. How well density is used to address specific areas.
- Lived on EWA but didn't get sleep – can't envision anyone wanting to live on this street – unbearably noisy and dirty – traffic will only get worse.
- responding to building heights in ERC Plan, support the plan – the heights relate best to the neighborhoods.
- Leslie C. – what does this document mean, if later another document can come along and concerned about the existing buildings and small houses there should be included.
- Steve. S. - Supports revision to building heights in ERC Plan, opportunity to create viable corridor, people won't be dashing from coffee shop to coffee shop, to enhance the pedestrian experience on EWA. Champs D'Elysees [is wide], can have vibrant pedestrian activity, without people dashing across, back and forth.
- RK – ERC plan was advisory on this, knowing the heights would be studied by the BUILD committee in the future.
- Bob H. If recommendations of 2 committees disagree – this will be addressed by ultimately the City Council
- Resident a block off EWA – E. Main/First St. Would like it to be developed more, could see residential area being strengthened, us residents would support these businesses, adding to, not taking away from Willy St., could be a cool spot in and of itself.
- Worked in corridor for many years, not resident, bike here, support the higher density and higher stories to get employment centers here and downtown.
- Was there another city used as inspiration for the design goals? No particular city.

- Lou Host-Jablonski – on Urban Design Commission but expressing own opinions – have some concerns – a lot of attention was given to design guidelines, step- and setbacks, and focusing on corridor, this is charge of committee so it's natural. Observes a pattern that will occur, encouraging height and density along blvd, will have dense buildings in center, with parking off streets (back), parking drives the building, can reduce parking, will still have, along main, will have parking, transparency won't take place with parking garages (no activity), will kill street, would like to see this addressed, how it interfaces with Willy St. neighborhood. South edge – how it is created – next generation along E. Main – should be given more attention.
- Gorham St. resident (Old Market, now Tenney Lapham) set backs on both sides will dissipate concerns, 3 D model is essential to alleviate some concerns, regarding water and parking – garages in ground – Gorman project is having an issue with the marsh nature of this area. Butler Plaza project – how many stalls/unit 1.3/unit, not filled. People living there, don't have cars, not filled. Rick Mackey project – same issue came up, he is having to rent parking because his units aren't using the spaces thought necessary. Rather than having corridor down EWA, to deal with traffic, have feeders like EJ, Gorham, etc.
- RK Can I ask for a connection of this to previous comment?
- BH No, let's hear this comment first.
- emphasis on varied set-backs?
- RK – making connection to parking issue and water – what are the constraints about under ground parking in this area?
- Curt Brink – relationship of cost of parking is directly proportional to cost on top; no visible parking lots on EWA. These are just guidelines, still have to go to commission; this site has no green space, question on storm water. State mandated storm water standards state that water must be managed on site. Yes, you can put parking under ground.
- Lou Host-Jablonski – farther East, deeper go, site by site issue, geological, varies.
- Profile section #1 doesn't make sense; every view on South are tall, North are shorter, will there be visual imbalance?
- P. Wolff – East Rail Corridor Plan process, were concerned heights balance needed, some kind of general feeling
- Mary Pulliam – North side of plan better developed is true, South side kind of abandoned, too far away. Stakeholders are concerned with blocks all along, more sense of ownership of main street, big gap in development, abstract planning vs. hands on,
- Marianne M. - committee struggled to look at context. A lot of concern about the context one with more residential other with commercial, a lot of thought went into it, two sides of avenue treated differently.
- Peter Wolff agrees with Mary
- RK – time for feedback from committee?
- Bob – no
- Hopes the process doesn't create wall between Marquette and TL neighborhood.
- Bob - other comments?
- Destroy neighborhoods, will push sprawl.
- Strongly disagree; don't see that density here will end sprawl, but we need to address this.
- Pedestrian underpass? Lots of density, then this will help a lot.

- Bob H. – anyone else to speak? Scott will display slides for you if you would like. Thank you for being here, for your thoughtful comments. Thank you all for coming. Feel free to stay around, open until 8:00pm.
- Peter W. Will this come back to the neighborhoods before City approval process?
- Bob H. This is last meeting of the public, public invited to the next committee meetings,
- Peter W. seems important that there should be another chance for neighborhoods to look at this before it goes through the city process.
- Bob H. most that will be done is completion of report
- Peter W. – would rather a setting like this, vs. going to a meeting like Urban Design Commission.
- Welcome to stay and have a good meeting.
To comment:
 1. Leave orange forms in boxes.
 2. Mail form to EINPC
 3. Email einpc@tds.net or mgay@cityofmadison.com

Committee will meet 3 more times. Nov. 28th, December 12th & Dec. 20th to focus on urban design guidelines. Comments due by Next Wednesday. Sooner better.

7:35 Adjourn Bob Horowitz followed by more viewing of displays and informal discussion