

**East Washington Avenue BUILD  
Capitol Gateway Corridor Land Use and Urban Design Plan  
Steering Committee Meeting # 11**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Approved 12/12/05**

**Monday, Nov. 28<sup>th</sup>, 2005, 5:00-8:00 pm (food and beverages provided)**

**945 E. Washington Ave**

**Meeting Chair: Bob Horowitz (absent)      Meeting Facilitator: Rebecca Krantz**

**Notetaker: Ben Winter**

**Purpose of meeting:** To review input from public Open House and modify Plan accordingly.

**Attendance and Summary of Meeting Discussion, Decisions, & Action Items here; more detailed notes, and transcriptions of feedback forms are attached.**

**Committee Members Present [in no intentional order]:**

*Brenda Konkel-Alder District 2, Marianne Morton-Commonwealth Development (first part of meeting), Curt Brink-Property owner, Phyllis Wilhelm-MGE, Anya Firsiroti-Greater Williamson Business Association (first part of meeting), Brad Mullins-Property owner, Teena Browder-East Johnson Street Business Association, Marsha Rummel-Marquette Neighborhood Association, Will Warlick-Marquette Neighborhood Association, Beth Cannestra -Emerson East Neighborhood Association, Catherine Debo-Madison Metro, Eric Swanson-Property owner, Kevin O'Driscoll-Downtown Madison, Inc. (2<sup>nd</sup> part of meeting), Ilse Hecht-Old Market Place Neighborhood*

**City Staff Present:**

*Mark Olinger-Planning and Development, Michael Gay-Office of Business Resources, Alan Martin – Planning and Development*

**Consulting Staff Present:** *Scott Harrington-Vandewalle, Dean Proctor- Vandewalle, Rebecca Krantz - EINPC, Ben Winter-EINPC*

**Committee Members, City Staff and Consulting Staff Absent with Notice:**

*Bob Horowitz-Community-wide representative, Susan Breitbach-East Capitol Business Association, Dan Rolfs – Real Estate*

**Without Notice:** *David Waugh-Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association, Judy Olson-Alder District 6, Mario Mendoza-City of Madison Mayor's Office, Michael Waidelich, Planning & Development, Brian Benford-Alder District 12, Bill Kunkler-Fiore Company*

**Meeting Summary**

**Minutes from November 1, 2005, approved.**

**The Committee agreed to the following bulk standards (also see maps):**

- **Height maximums (after step backs) on north side of E. Washington Ave:**
  - 8 stories from Blair to Livingston
  - 12 stories Livingston-Paterson and Brearly-Ingersoll
  - 3 stories Ingersoll to half-way between Baldwin & Dickinson
  - 8 stories from half-way between Baldwin & Dickinson to the Yahara River
  - 8 stories RR tracks to First St.
- **Height maximums (after step backs) on south side of E. Washington Ave:**
  - 15 stories Blair to Baldwin
  - 12 stories Baldwin to Dickinson

*Funders of this project include the Dane County BUILD program, the City of Madison, Marquette Neighborhood Association, MG&E, The Mullins Group, Curt Brink, and Research Products, Inc.*

- Dickenson St. to Thornton St. block is split lengthwise, allowing 12 stories on the half closest to East Wash., and 8 stories on the half closer to East Main.
- 8 stories River to First St.
- **Washington Ave Setback min/max - 10'-20' and 10' minimum step back**
- **Facade heights 3-5 stories, with 3 story maximums in some places.**
- **Mifflin St. Setback min/max – 5'-20' and maximum angle (45 degrees) for minimum step back.**
- **Main St. from Blair to Ingersoll, Setback min/max – 5-10', min. step back 10'.**
- **Main St. Dickinson-Thornton , Setback min/max – 5-10', min step back 10'.**
- **Main St. Thornton – First St., Setback min/max – 5-20', step back is to follow 45-degree angle.**
- **Side streets on North side of E. Wash. setbacks changed to 5-10 feet (from 0-10).**
- **Side streets on South side setbacks remain at 0-10 feet.**

## **Detailed notes of November 28, 2005, BUILD Committee Meeting**

### **A. WELCOME, AGENDA REVIEW, MINUTES**

Rebecca announced that Chair Bob Horowitz was ill and asked if the Committee wanted one of the vice-chairs to chair the meeting. The Committee asked Rebecca to facilitate without a chair. Rebecca reviewed the agenda, saying we would be mostly looking at open house feedback and discussion with decision-making regarding changes to the draft plan.

Minutes from Nov. 1<sup>st</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> approved with no changes.

Curt: Bulk standards on map and those of notes are different, number of stories. Rebecca: Return to this when we discuss modifying draft.

### **B. OPEN HOUSE FEED BACK**

Rebecca summarized: Only 9 people filled out comment cards, they are summarized in the notes. Many areas people liked, and a number of areas that people didn't like. Transportation issues were big and a big concern with parking. Many concerns with pedestrian friendliness and alternative means of transportation with specific locations like E. Main. A smattering of environmental issues, some housing issues, some commercial, a lot of comments on the bulk standards. Strong consensus on the overall massing of the standards, but some specific comments conflicted with each other. There are a lot of comments but there doesn't seem to be a strong direction of the public voice. Some concerns about conflicting with East Rail Corridor Plan. Anybody else take away any additional lessons from public meeting?

Marianne & Marsha—Many people mentioned E. Main not getting much attention.

Will—seemed that some people were concerned about too high of height limits. Marianne—I think it was very mixed.

Rebecca—and there was no consensus process to attempt to determine how much agreement there was with the comments we heard. Other people's impression?

Michael G.—I wonder if we have a profile of neighborhood residents vs. business with respect to their inputs.

Bradley—I didn't see many business people there.

Michael—I spent more time at the exit/entrance trying to get people to fill out forms, but several times people said they thought we were doing a good job, but they didn't want to write it

down. I couldn't get people to fill out the forms! But I got tons of great feedback on the presentation and the consensus process. APPLAUSE

Phyllis—I think we can take that as a vote of confidence. No news is good news.

### **C. Ideas for addressing public feedback**

Scott—This is the last meeting to talk about the corridor plan. The next two meetings are for urban design guidelines... where all the nitty gritty details are. Let's focus on getting a concept and then nuance it in the Urban Design Guidelines. So let's stay focused without getting into the guidelines. Before next meeting you'll get a draft of the design guidelines. Under our contract with the City, we need a finalized draft by the end of tonight. If there's something you saw at the meeting, we've got it.

I think the Committee made a lot of progress last meeting, but the larger picture was lost. [We have some proposals for changes based on public meeting and thinking about Committee's work so far].

Dean—I'm going to start where we left off. We were going to simplify our bulk standards. And try to make overall concept more logical. These standards represent a lot of concepts... the idea of step backs to create a pedestrian scale. One idea was to make façades 4 to 10 stories... maybe too big of a range. There could be a little more remediation in the step backs.

Define terms: setback, façade height, step back, and internal building height. What are these numbers going to be? So there should be some consistent façade height, which won't be monotonous, but provide some kind of consistency. *Overlay of supposed façade height limits*. I propose we make the maximum façade heights to 5 stories. These are not new ideas, they just simplify our ideas.

Curt—We were 4 to 10 on this side. The problem of setting a height across the board constricts any future creative work. Too restrictive.

Dean—The concept that there's a logical stepping down. That maximum heights could occur on the Southside, stepping down getting closer to residential areas. Very similar to East Rail Corridor Plan, represent concept of gradually stepping down towards the river.

Marianne—But you have 12 stories on this side of East Wash but we haven't discussed it.

Scott—The whole Northside got figured out quickly, the Southside we had problems.

Dean—The last piece is a simple chart with three different levels of setbacks and step backs.

*Overhead with range of numbers*

In summary, this is the profile we have... *the blue represents the skirt concept*, the strategy here is that the front façade is just a little sliver.

Rebecca—Do you have any comments on these three specific bullet points (on agenda)?

Overall urban form concept (addressed by above comments), pedestrian friendliness (skirt proposed), traffic impacts.

Marianne—Have to leave after 6pm, one question... I think the max height somewhere between 5-8 would be better on E. Main on this side of the river 1400 block. My concern is that 12 is too high for that area.

Brad—I understand Marianne's concern, but I don't think it's adverse to any residential area because it's not blocking the sun. I'd be more concerned with the Department of Administration (DOA) area. Our plan (for the 12 height limit) is for class A tenants from Chicago and Milwaukee... this is a user that will take 40,000 square feet and asked us about that block... they are very excited about that block and see that area compared to sites in

Milwaukee and Chicago. They're asking what kind of height they can get because they were interested in the Capitol Square area. What we envision is mixed use and office... this would be a stepping stone for the redevelopment and I would hate to give a height restriction. They want no lower than Capitol Square heights. Probably 10 stories is a minimum for them. But they'd really like 13 stories. I think it would be oriented more toward the Avenue and lowered toward Main St.

Kevin—Can there be a height differential if it's a business use vs. residential use? We should all support a big office user. I'm not saying that 14 stories is a good answer, but....

Rebecca—Technically can that be done?

Catherine—We need to be clear about feet, not stories.

Brad—I don't envision a vision that is one use... [example of another area], we built a four-story underneath it "phantom" parking, where parking is hidden by retail uses.

Rebecca—Back to question on can it be done to have different height limits for different uses?

Mark—I don't know why you couldn't, but problem is depending on how the use may change over time.

Marianne—I think 12 is too high for that block

Scott—This is something that can be put into Urban Design Guidelines.

Marsha—When I think about East Washington, I think that's where the height should go, but we should worry more about height limits on East Main, etc.

Rebecca—Do people prefer to take a vote about the height on that particular segment or block?

Scott—Urban Design Guidelines need to be tied back into the vision.

Will—Why don't we vote on this height like we did on the other blocks.

Brad—I can tell you that this prospect doesn't want to have a Main St. address as I suppose the other prospects won't either. The expectation is that we need height and certainly along the Avenue.

Scott—Our plan will guide the Ordinance. Setting a shell or envelope and we'll nuance it later.

Marsha—How does the idea of incentives work with Will's idea?

Mark—You can put in incentives within the plan. We could say that this is the plan, but we can say, you do this... something different like open space, so we'll give you another story. There are things that we can do to drive the form.

Will—Modify my proposal... 8 story max. for that block, possibility for incentives for additional stories.

Kevin—But the incentives should apply for all the way through.

Rebecca—So from Dickinson to Thornton, 8 overall with incentives?

Curt—I can't second this because we've dealt with incentives, but they don't work. My problem is that we're out of the guidelines and into the ordinance. We're trying to design the whole building. Any other businesses that would be coming in here would be coming into the periphery [of Madison otherwise]. We can't restrict it that much.

Brenda—I think "incentives" is the wrong word.

Beth—I like the idea of having a split... the bulk more towards East Wash... transitional towards E. Main... I'm not too keen on the incentives.

Marsha—I'd rather split the block too.

Kevin—Could the City define some incentives rather than just pulling them out of the air?

Scott—Let's go back to keeping the plan simple... we have two meetings for these guidelines, for nuances, incentives, bonuses... let's leave it for now, a split and come back to it. We can put a note on the monopoly board to split the block for now.

Brad—The bonuses or incentives, I don't think we're going to get there tonight... but if this goes to eight stories, this prospect won't happen. If I can tell them that on the Avenue they can get 12 stories, it would be a good sale...

Eric—We tried to do a lot of this with step backs and setbacks; my own opinion is that we stick with broad guidelines. We should be as broad as we can. Don't limit it too much.

Rebecca—With a skirt... motion to split block from Dickinson to Thornton lengthwise, have 12 stories on East Wash., and 8 on East Main

**8 in favor out of 13 no abstentions.**

Brenda—Having a problem with 0-10 foot setbacks for side streets NORTHSIDE... we should change to 5-10.

Rebecca – Change to 5-10 ft setbacks on side streets on NORTHSIDE.

**12 out of 13... motion carries**

Scott—This is another thing that will be nuanced in urban guidelines, is

Beth—Let's make 5-10 feet on all side streets.

Al-We have setbacks on every street now...

Will—I think the consultant's plan is good.

Brenda—The difference to me is between residential areas and others.

Rebecca—Proposal is to change 0-10 to 5-10 on all side streets on SOUTHSIDE. **12 opposed Stays at 0-10**

Rebecca—Any proposals to change [heights or facades]? Curt thinks 5-story max. façade is too restrictive.

Curt—Yes, and it was 15-17 stories in the notes.

Scott—I guess we felt that FAA was the guide.

Marsha—I got an email from Bob Horowitz... *She reads his email, text included here:*

Bob:

At the public meeting, I heard widespread and strong opposition to the heights being proposed for the south side of East Washington Avenue.

After listening to the public comments, I believe that the Committee should reconsider and limit the maximum heights south of East Washington Avenue to 10 stories, for several reasons.

First, that is necessary to respect neighborhoods, help East Main Street become a pedestrian scale street with a neighborhood feel, and avoid pushing additional traffic on to East Main Street.

Second, that is necessary to protect the Capitol view by providing a balanced visual frame for the Capitol.

Third, the benefits of exceeding ten stories are limited.

Fourth, a major disparity between our plan and the East Rail Corridor plan will weaken what our Committee has accomplished.

Mark—The FAA is advisory, but the County has never appealed it.

Curt—We never got a broad base consensus at the public meeting because the Chair kept the comments within a small group of people to reflect his own, personal opinions.

Will—The language in the South Park St. guidelines might be useful, that there's an "out." If there's another planning group, then you can supersede the original story guideline.

Mark—I would prefer that there shouldn't be an out.

Rebecca—Does anyone want to make Bob's idea of 10 stories a motion?

**NO ONE MOTIONS**

Will—Well, maybe we can make lower stories and allow incentives.

Beth—I think this starts to address the canyonization effect of Gorham.

Eric—There have been additional comments from public that we need additional density. One of the great things Vandewalle Associates did was show us how we can create pedestrian

sized, yet keeping the density. [We already voted on this.] We have to figure out where we want to accept the guidelines and tear into it ...

Brenda—Height doesn't equal density, why bother have a public meeting if we're not going to listen to them? I understand we voted, but in some areas we're going to have to reconsider some things.

Catherine—Could we put a grey line around our facilities so we can show that METRO facilities are not going to be expected to make radical changes. Because we are going to tear down parts of our facility and rebuild.

Scott—I think that will be captured in the Urban Design Ordinance.

### **BREAK**

Scott—I think we need to have more decision-making and less discussion. I think we need to just vote up or down. We cannot write Urban Design Guidelines for the Ordinance until we make decisions. We've been cautioned by the City to stay away from incentives and bonuses. Stretch yourselves a little bit and we'll see what we get in Urban Design Guidelines.

Ilse—Its unclear to me to what extent people [at the Open House] were objecting to the heights. Do we pay attention to one or two people?

Kevin—I make a motion to accept what's up there [the consultants' proposals for height maximums: Northside, 8 stories Blair-Livingston, 12 Livingston-Paterson and Brearily-Ingersoll, 3 stories Ingersoll to half-way between Baldwin & Dickinson, then 8 stories to the river, 8 stories RR tracks to First St.; South Side, 15 stories Blair to Baldwin, 12 stories to Dickinson, 12/8 Dickinson to River as above, 8 to First St. (see map)].  
Motion Seconded

Discussion: Marsha—Could we talk about East Main St. now?

Scott—I think your issue is a step back issue, which we'll get to next.

Marsha—I think 15 stories on East Main St. is not pedestrian friendly. I'm not sure how to get there.

Will—There's one block that we haven't discussed. East of the Yahara on Southside... It's entirely out of scale for the houses on that block.

Dean – Step back & angle will address that.

Will - I'll withdraw that because of the skirt and angle.

Rebecca—Other proposals? None, all those in favor of consultants' height recommendations?

**9 In favor, 1 Opposed, 1 Abstention.**

Rebecca - FAÇADE HEIGHTS:

Scott—Idea of façade height is to bring consistency. Where 5 came from is more or less the Mautz building. Our recommendation is really 3-5 because 4-10 allows for too much variability. But it still allows artistic variability.

Rebecca—Can you repeat the maximum amount of building square-footage lost by the reduction in façade height you're proposing?

Dean—Lose a half of 1 % of square footage from going from 4-10 to 3-5 stories for façade.

Rebecca—Is there a motion?

Will – [move to approve] ... Marsha seconds.

Discussion: Beth—Since we've got the 3-5 range, I'd say leave it as is.

Kevin—3-5 strikes me as too low because of my vision for East Wash. Originally I thought our vision was more like the Capitol Square—10 stories.

Curt—The building on the corner here is 5 stories and we've maximized that whole range... I don't know where the flexibility is if...

Rebecca—In the ordinance, it's possible to put in nuances and specifics.

Scott—Is this a concept we can deal with, and we can get into the nuances later?

Curt – Too strict with façade. We're twice as wide as Gorham and the canyon effect won't be as much for East Wash. We're not that same street.

Marsha—I don't see this as a pedestrian friendly street anyways.

Will—I like all these ideas... I propose that the areas that currently say 5 should be four to six story facades. (no second)

Rebecca—All those in favor of accepting consultants' proposed façade maximums [3-5 stories, as indicated on map] **8 in favor, motion carries.**

## SETBACKS & STEP BACKS

### No changes for:

**Washington Ave, 10'-20' Setback and 101 minimum step back**

**Mifflin St. 5'-20' Setback and maximum angle (45 degrees) for minimum step back**

Scott—There was no discussion on setbacks for Main Street at the November 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.

### Main (Blair to Ingersoll) 0-10 discussion:

Scott—Looks like there's already natural setbacks.

Curt—I don't know if you can make it a walkway, per se.

Rebecca—I heard a proposal to make Main St. setback 5-10 ft. Beth Seconded.

[Unanimous?] **MOTION CARRIES**

Step back: Proposal is 10 ft.

Rebecca—Any discussion on this?

Will—Should there be a greater step back to help make East Main more pedestrian friendly?

Scott—Given the land use already in place across the street, we didn't see a real need with a larger step back.

Mark—I'm not sure if a reasonably tall building is antithetical to a pedestrian friendly street.

There are other things that we can do to make it look more friendly. Example:

Streetlamps, etc.

Rebecca—All those in favor 10 foot step back on E. Main from Blair to Ingersoll.

**10 in favor MOTION CARRIES**

### Main (Dickinson to First street)

Will—Should be the same as Blair to Ingersoll – Motion. Brad seconds.

## FOR BOTH NORTH AND SOUTH SIDES

### Blair to Ingersoll 5-10

### Dickinson to Thornton 5-10

### Thornton to 1st 5-20

Brad—Motion to adopt 10' step back on north and south.

**All in favor, motion carries**

## G. Next Steps

What will the Plan look like? Scott lays out a couple of options – more like first draft, or more like what we've got now, with mostly graphics, and appendices with background info.

Mark—I'd like a document that is understandable by people other than professionals.  
Large vs. small lots will affect how the form of this area will develop.  
Scott – That would probably be what we've got now, mostly graphics with descriptions.  
Our goal is to get a draft plan out to the City by next week.

Rebecca—Let's clarify the role of this Committee in crafting the Urban Design Ordinance. Final approval of will be at?

Mark - The Common Council. An option is: A committee could be a referral agency... with one last look at the plan. Could be staffed by the City.

Rebecca—Do people like the idea of reconvening in January or February (or March) to review?  
People nodded.

Teena – Clarified that this means Committee members have to fill in the conflict of interest declaration forms again.