

Village of Shorewood Hills University Avenue Corridor Plan Public Meeting #2 Responses

Introduction:

The Village of Shorewood Hills held two community engagement opportunities for the public to weigh in on two potential concepts for the University Avenue corridor. An in-person public meeting was held on May 11th and was attended by approximately 20 people. An online survey that was available from May 11th through May 30th and generated 3 responses.

The in-person meeting began with a brief presentation on Concept 1. Attendees were given individual worksheets to write down some initial thoughts. After that, attendees were broken into small groups to share their thoughts and discuss the concepts with each other. Next, the small groups were asked to share their thoughts with the whole group. The process was repeated for Concept 2. The group was asked to vote on the concept they liked the best at the end of the meeting.

This process was designed to facilitate communication between attendees and to give every attendee an opportunity to state their individual opinions in the way that was most comfortable for them to do so. This summary begins with the overall survey, large group summaries, small group summaries, and finally the individual feedback. The online survey responses are included in the individual feedback section.

Overall Survey:

At the end of the in-person public meeting on May 11th, attendees were asked if they could support Concept 1, Concept 2, either concept equally, or neither of the concepts. The results were:

Concept	Responses
Concept 1	3
Concept 2	11
Either	0
None	5

Large Group Exercise

At the in-person public meeting on May 11th, attendees were asked to share the top ideas from their small group discussions with the larger group. These summaries are a recording of those large group discussions.

Large Group Summary: **Concept 1**

	Likes	Dislikes
Building Height and Density on University Avenue	Open Spaces	Don't like parking lots Canyon lands- 4 stories same level Would like taller
Building Height and density on Locust Street	2-3 with step back Best for noise, shadow, activity Blends with other housing	Lack of step back
Green space and stormwater management		Too limited Not enough stormwater management
Land use mix	Improved	Could be better
Gathering space		Lack of this. Needs more Missing green ribbon for pedestrians
Transportation and circulation	Structured parking- more of this	Missing pedestrian greenway
Streetscape (university ave vs. locust street)	Increased density	Missing diversity at doorways, awnings, and plantings
Projected taxable value	Good to increase	Could be better use

Overall, what do you like most about **Concept 1**?

Adding residential and structured parking

Overall, what do you dislike most about **Concept 1**?

Surface parking and lack of greenway

Large Group Summary: Concept 2

	Likes	Dislikes
Building Height and Density on University Avenue	Ok	
Building Height and Density on Locust Street	Bridge too far (should be 2-3)	
Green Space and Stormwater Management	Good use of both! Good use of green terrace along university avenue	
Land Use Mix	Condo or townhome ownership unit! Village hall on locust our intention idea to consider	No mixed us on locust, height is a non-starter, needs to be 2-3 stories
Gathering Space	Outstanding fountain! Great green ribbon. E/W down center	
Transportation and Circulation	Taking away paved north end of Joyce Erdman is good!	
Streetscape (University Ave vs. Locust Street)	University Avenue ok. Locust too tall.	
Projected taxable value	Good increase, even if locust is not as tall; this would be a 10% increase in total village assessed value	

Overall, what do you like most about Concept 2?

Green ribbon, pedestrian scale amenities

Overall, what do you dislike most about Concept 2?

Height and mixed use on locust

Small Group Exercise

At the in-person public meeting on May 11th, attendees were split into small groups and asked to discuss their top likes and dislikes for each concept. Each group had a table recorder to document the discussion. The top likes and dislikes for each concept are summarized below.

Small Group Summaries: **Concept 1**

Top Likes:

- Parking under structure
- Heights ok but boring architecture
- Stormwater management is essential
- Good to mix residential and commercial
- Great to have charging station next to coffee shop
- Modest increase in tax revenue
- 2-4 story

Top Dislikes:

- Architecture is boring/ need some setback from University Ave
- Not enough green space
- Not enough gathering space
- Tax revenue increase is not enough
- Too much traffic on locust
- Need diversity at streetscape level

Small Group Summaries: **Concept 2**

Top Likes:

- More tax revenue
- More green space/less surface parking
- More intentional design
- Increased height on University Ave with staggered set back
- Increased green space, parking underground
- Mix of residential and commercial
- Tax revenues better
- Increased green corridor- creating greenspace
- Stormwater
- Like that the housing and commercial area be accessed on University Ave

Top Dislikes:

- Too tall, especially building H...blocks the sun
- Village hall should be more centrally located
- Will businesses thrive? visible signage? Useful front doors? (eg lots of small businesses turnover in the boulevard)
- Parking garage above ground unless garden on top
- Joyce Erdman Place as road? Not good idea
- More green space, not enough trees
- Traffic hard to understand
- Parking access from locust
- Village Hall seems out of place > should be more central in Village
- Too much congestion on locust- no mixed use
- No 8-10 stories, losing neighborhood feel

Individual Worksheet Exercise

Individuals in attendance were given an opportunity to anonymously share their opinion via a worksheet. Those responses were transcribed and are summarized below.

Concept 1: Building Height and Density on University Avenue

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height is ok on university ave- 4 stories ok • 3 stories or less • 3 stories • Yes for height up to 5 • Taller towards university, limit 4 stories • Taller buildings on University • Good and appropriate • Should be higher density along university ave, not high enough • Like to modest increase of building height, less scary then a big change • Parking under structure • OK • Ok. Higher would be too imposing if there isn't space between buildings and set back • Height is less of a factor if the architecture were imaginative • The addition of residential; especially with opportunity for owner occupied. Some gathering spaces, the rounded corners! • Dense development along university— close to BRT, shields against noise, space for retail, not too tall 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing more than 4 stories • >3 stories • Not more than 5 stories • No passage through block- must walk around • Drivers unable to see businesses and plan their turns to reach them. Fake entrances on University Ave • Not much change with respect to parking. Will it really be welcoming to pedestrians? • Too low, architecture is boring • Height too low, density too low • More trees • Variety is important, not just height • Too much surface parking, designed for vehicles not human based interactions, needs more green buffer, clearly marked areas for bike traffic separate from pedestrian & vehicular • Feels too separated. Would benefit from spaces between the buildings NOT devoted to parking like plazas with outdoor spaces for eating, fountains, walking, etc.

Concept 1: Building Height and Density on Locust Street

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2-3 at most, underground parking • 2 stories • 2 stories • Keep 2 if at all possible • Lower- 2-3 • Less tall on locust • Height seems ok • Lower density along locust • Additional residential; especially if owner occupied. townhomes good scale for blending with residential to the north, change in use of Locust Drive to a residential street. • Love the residential next to locust, good fit for the slower pace, close to bike trail, also a good spot for condo development/row houses. • 4-5 story ok • Like 2-3 story height • Lower heights, height becomes less a factor if the architecture were imaginative • Like the 2 story limit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep residential • No tall buildings (not too tall) • Not too tightly clustered. Keep residential, not commercial. Mindful of Telly H backyard sizes, better toward Shorewood Blvd. • Too many buildings for Locust. Shade cover in winter? • This density will be a big change. May upset nearby residents • This density will be a big change. May upset nearby residents • Architecture is boring, ok • Height too low, density too low, more attention to design • Architecture combine trees with buildings (cantilevered) • Lack of gathering & play for families, feels like the human experience is being shortchanged instead of the center purpose; human well-being is only slightly considered

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OK 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too short. Could easily be four stories without towering over the neighborhood which would add more housing and more tax base. Also, would be nice to have nearby outdoor areas for a playground for kids, green space, etc.
--	--

Concept 1: Green Space and Stormwater Management

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't know anything about stormwater management, but in favor of management • Water retention/ for green space • More green space • More pervious surface • Not enough as is, need some green space and gathering space. Definitely need water management • Only somewhat more pervious (green) space for percolation • You told us nothing about stormwater management- ESSENTIAL • The more the better, use new concept for water retention • Can't tell • I think space at Joyce Erdman PI is nice. • I like the included outdoor space. Would keep all of it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will any of the greenspaces be big enough to attract people to actually go into it? Walk in, sit down? • Not enough green space • Not enough green space, more trees • Not enough • Appears too limited in green space • Lack of Storm water management visible; underneath? The vehicle traffic dominates the use, can it be eliminated at Joyce Erdman PI? • Not enough outdoor space not devoted to parking. Would put it under buildings or in hidden internal garage to maximize walkable space for people and families. • Not enough • Minimize flooding

Concept 1: Land Use Mix

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal. Some stores • More retail, less residential. 2/3 to 1/3 ratio • Variety of business and residential ok but concentrate solely residential toward locust • Good residential, but should be condos- equity • Permit walkways between buildings • Good to mix residential and commercial • Yes-mixed use • Love the fact multiple businesses and housing would be close to each other and many forms of transit. It's also good that existing businesses don't always have to be displaced. • Ok, good idea on university ave, not on locust • Seems poor, but for C which has shops and apartments above • changing surface parking into residential; especially if there is opportunity for individuals to buy the units. This is fundamental in building wealth equity. • Too much surface parking, park under structure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much surface parking • Mostly dense (too many) • Prefer more density and green space • Still a lot • Get rid of existing building to create more space for creative use • Too much surface parking • More trees! • We have an opportunity to use the space of long-term community growth, not fast cash for developers. I dislike the notion that we must get the best \$/square foot instead of the priceless gain of community involvement • No complaints, I like mixed use a lot.

Concept 1: Gathering Space

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't see any • Maybe? • Not necessary • Yes, but needs to be real green space and gathering area. Current plan that fled had for the former Kohl's development's reality vs space created • Mildly interesting for adults • Permit walkways between buildings • Where is it? • I like that it is located at the center of these two areas & it is continuous from the north to south • I like the inclusion of plaza like pavers with space for outdoor dining. • This would be good- I like the picnic tables idea and pedestrian walkways with more parking underneath buildings • Can't tell • Yes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depends who it draws... • Token spaces. Unappealing to kids • Not much • Not enough • Need a fountain to gather around • Not enough gathering options • I dislike the access seems to be only along a street where vehicles rule. More pedestrian connectivity away from motors; both car and bike. • It appears to lack a unified theme or sense of place. This could be a cozy quaint area with a walkable, accessible pedestrian focus and with spaces for farmers markets, music nights, and family events, but it's taken up by too much surface parking.

Concept 1: Transportation and Circulation

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much traffic on Locust (heavy traffic). Like biking • Locust is not big enough to handle increase traffic generated by apartments along the road. It is already very congested from traffic generated by apartments to the west of garden homes • Yes for University Avenue • Unclear about residential parking • Permit walkways between buildings • Not clear • Ok, but more attention to details • Charging stations cafes/ restaurants • Walkways for pedestrians between buildings so pedestrian friendly • The BRT easy access, vehicles and bikes move freely on the streets • Love that high density housing is located near transit on university and bike lanes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much congestion at the present time of Locust • Need light on Erdman • Underground practical on Locust? • Similar to current • Not clear • More places to walk • More places to walk/sit • That people have to move around the vehicles. Too many vehicle access points, not enough places to be safe away from cars & motorized bikes. • There should be more housing for more tax revenue and to diversify the populous.

Concept 1: Streetscape (University Avenue vs. Locust Street)

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscaping • Low profile • Need some setback but not surface parking • Some setback would be good • Hard to know- height is not only variable. Need more diversity in shops and meeting places • Continuation of an urban feel; that is the right place for this • University avenue height should be higher than locust height. (Building height) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not seeing much in landscaping • Too much (planters, or things on sidewalk) • Needs to be wide enough to have trees and walking • Boring and need some setback • Emphasis on parking, where are our beautiful trees? more buffer with plantings, features from the traffic • Should add 1-2 more stories on top of this plan.

Concept 1: Projected Taxable Value

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be better • generally it is good to grow the revenue for taxes. This is a big change from what we now have, it may be a good step for now. • I like more housing— demand is sky high and this is a PRIME area for investment close to the hospitals and university and shopping and grocery stores. LOTS of people would pay to live here. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Probably too low • Higher/more • I don't like big decisions based on making developers rich. Too much emphasis is on the money being made at the expense of growing a neighborhood with possibilities to grow personal wealth. • Needs more housing units, both condos and apartments. Condos are in short supply in Madison. Young professionals are looking for starter homes, and many would pay 2-\$400k for a new 2-3 bd condo in a walkable area close to amenities.

Concept 1: Other Component. (Please specify in comments)

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I like activating what is now unused surface parking lot into vibrant areas for folks to live, work and gather. I think there is opportunity to put green space on the top of the parking structure for recreational use • Need fewer buildings, more green space 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When we invite more use, we may more need for services, I would like to see these weighed into the decisions. like more trash, more noise, higher demand on utilities. What infrastructure will need to change?

Overall, what do you like most about Concept 1?

Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low profile, height of buildings. Underground parking • Not much, except mixed use • Some mix of shops with lodging • I like the townhomes, and the new use for what is now surface parking • Like the overall intent with mixed use, more housing, and outdoor spaces.

Overall, what do you dislike most about Concept 1?

Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apartments/ residential units along locust • No discussion of charging stations • Uninspired plans of the rectangular; one three story can be either the same or different; more imaginative. Avoid becoming a canyon with dead space between buildings. Need more gathering space • I dislike that the people navigating this area have to be on guard from vehicles, crossing streets and parking lots to see their neighbors • I wish it was a few degrees more intense— a few more stories and more outdoor space dedicated to people and not cars.

Overall, would you support Concept 1 if that were the future development pattern within the University Avenue Corridor? (Select one option below)

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	50.00%	2
No	50.00%	2
	Answered	4
	Skipped	12

Individual Worksheet Feedback

Concept 2: Building Height and Density on University Avenue

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like but not 10 stories, 5 stories preferred • 4-5 story building • Higher is fine • Like increased height and the trees in front • Like the heights and setbacks, I like the setbacks shown better than the boulevard building • Exciting to include more deliberate pedestrian ways • Too tall. Downtown tall • Like higher density • The open connected green space, the pedestrian focused design, lack of interruption of vehicle traffic for pedestrians • LOVE the height on university. Doesn't tower over Shorewood (too far away), decreases noise pollution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not more than 8! • 5 stories are ok • 10 story building • 8-10 story development • Building E looks kind of narrow • Really tall..kind of big change and very urban feel • The height of the buildings is overwhelming to what we have seen in the Village before. • Nothing to dislike, I think people would like it more than they realize.

Concept 2: Building Height and Density on Locust Street

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is "I" Possible village hall? • Lower- architecturally varied • Like increased height but not mixed use • Building I is ok to have height near Shorewood Blvd. • Residential and businesses on Locust • Appropriate for this area. Doesn't tower over the neighborhood due to the street and train tracks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 stories only • Reduce to 2-3 floors only • Apartments on locust, only want 2-3 stories • "H" no residential 4-5 story • Not enough trees • Building H is too tall near west end of Tally Ho and feels nearer to those residents • Will block tally ho views • Concerned with increased traffic for cars, trucks, e bikes, motorized gizmos and pedestrians. These pathways are congested and may be unsafe for children. • Nothing I dislike, totally agree.

Concept 2: Green Space and Stormwater Management

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like • Like extra space, need stormwater holding tanks • F stormwater G Green Space • Combine both functions- retain water when no walkers during rainstorms • OK • Like increased attention to green space and water management • See "gathering space" • Generous. Lots of possibility • Like green space • Connected and larger! great places for events, casual gatherings and improved use of land • MUCH better than plan 1. Better sense of space, more open areas, could honestly be more enjoyable than Hilldale which has narrow sidewalks with cars driving through it. Love the focal point with the fountain drop off area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Idea is good but am concerned in reality if it will be still too small to be fully useful or used! Again, thinking of the spaces placed at time of Kohl's development and the reality was quite different • would prefer to have better storm water detention in all green space and even shorter in the parking lots • No complaints.

Concept 2: Land Use Mix

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like • Good commercial/residential mix/ratio • Residences above ground level stores • Like mix • Like the variety and spacing of larger buildings interspersed with green space • I like that this is a micro community. easily navigated by people, multi-use, I love the idea of having a Village building for community use • Love the mixed use, lots of people would love living here. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would prefer more community spaces • No tall buildings (NO 8-10 story) • Dislike the village hall and community center here- not central to Shorewood Hills village • Rather have village hall more centrally located (past faun park or DPW building) • How does it connect with the rest of the village? • Nothing I dislike.

Concept 2: Gathering Space

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like • Good encouragement of neighborhood • Places to sit, playground activities mixed in • Good idea in terms of gathering space but need more • Like increased gathering space • Joyce Erdman place is a wide road now, what is its real purpose or value. Looks like a traffic jam in the circle! • Much better! Bigger green space that might actually be used • Purpose build fountain and landscape design • layout, design, multi-use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too small • Design with gathering space as high priority. Avoid canyon look • In shade from tall buildings • Do not like village hall • I'd like to see green space for recreation on top of the parking garages. • A playground would be a great fit.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Love the bigger, better defined gathering spaces. This could be the second-best place to spend the evening getting dinner, eating outside, with trees, lights, and a fountain, shielded from the traffic noise by the buildings. 	
--	--

Concept 2: Transportation and Circulation

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like that University Ave buildings have access off University Locust is too congested for the size of the road Walk/bike- cars on university avenue Unclear- need better circulation access to underground parking I love the no through street in the middle More units near transit or bike trails means less cars on the roads. This area is perfect for this, right next to BRT, bike lanes, jobs, and shopping. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like structural parking (too much traffic) Joyce Erdman Place Joyce Erdman place doesn't seem like a good idea How to access parking areas? Unclear garage access the busy streets surrounding the development

Concept 2: Streetscape (University Avenue vs. Locust Street)

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good presentation, breaking up building facades Like more height Prefer some setbacks with attention to tree plantings high density on University and medium density on Locust Appropriate for scale. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to be respectful of Tally H Have parking access from locust Put parking underground Business visibility terrible for locust. Shade, ice, not good for biking The island nature of this parcel Nothing to complain about.

Concept 2: Projected Taxable Value

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like The increase in taxable value not worth sacrificing the appearance of the Village as a Village, not a huge city Looks ok Yes Obviously better than concept 1 I'm guessing the value is higher revenue for the Village Better than project 1, more units, more citizens, more taxes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I dislike using the money for community design No concerns.

Concept 2: Other Component. (Please specify in comments)

What do you like?	What do you dislike?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic calming on locust bringing together live, work, shop and gather all in one place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I dislike the attitude that this is OK here on University Avenue and not other places in the Village like U Bay Drive

Overall, what do you like most about Concept 2?

Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I like that it is responsive to county needs for housing • Increase in green space • The possibility of mixing; need shops in interior. Make Joyce Erdman drive a pedestrian walk and mingling space • This feels more human designed with the well-being of the human considered over the ease of driving a car • Higher density • I LOVE the density. As a young professional looking for a home in the area, I would move here in a heartbeat. Especially if 2-3 bd condos aimed at young families were built—most units are aimed at young professionals, which is fine, but there are a lot of young families and this would be perfect for them.

Overall, what do you dislike most about Concept 2?

Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A little too aggressive for facing University Ave • Increased congestion on Locust, loss of identity of Shorewood as a neighborhood • Need more trees on top of parking structures- put terrace gardens up there. • Needs more green space • Not sure business would thrive. • It is a big change from what we have now. It washes out much of our history and I am afraid we will lose the woodlands we have come to love. • I could see residents being intimidated by the height of the buildings, but I think it would actually not be that noticeable due to the distance from the single-family home part of the neighborhood and the backdrop of the hills to the south.

Overall, would you support Concept 2 if that were the future development pattern within the University Avenue Corridor? (Select one option below)

Answer Choices	Responses	
Yes	80.00%	4
No	20.00%	1
	Answered	5
	Skipped	11

Other Email Comment Received (5/12/23):

Several people tonight talked about architecture and how so many new buildings look alike. I think we were all in agreement that we wanted as much greenspace and as many trees as possible. Here’s something to pass on to the consultants Shorewood is working with, have a look at the fantastic pictures. Such approaches are one way to stay connected to nature as the village becomes more urbanized. Our applications would of course be on a smaller scale. <https://www.designboom.com/architecture/vincent-callebaut-architectures-treescrapers-climate-responsive-vertical-villages-nyc-05-03-2023/>