

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: September 2, 2009
TITLE: 666 Wisconsin Avenue – PUD(GDP-SIP) – Edgewater Hotel Expansion. 2 nd Ald. Dist. (15511)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: September 2, 2009	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn Weber, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Ron Luskin, Mark Smith and Richard Wagner.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 2, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 666 Wisconsin Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Paul Gibler, Barry Avery, Richard Baker, Bob Dunn, Amy Supple, Dave Knoche, Jim Carley, Dan Burke, Rosemary Lee, Erik Minton, Scott Faulkner, Scott Watson, Leonard Shelton, Sonya Newenhouse, Matthew Apter, Tim Ribber, Teddy Walsh, Sam Lawrence, Carole Schaeffer, James Tye, Lynne Faulkner, Andrew Docter, James A. Vick, Harvey Wendel, representing Pinckney Place Condominiums; Scott Vaughn, representing Building Trades Council; David Boetcher, representing IBEW Local 159; and Ryan Oehlhof, representing IUOE Local 139. Registered in opposition were Pat Sheldon, Thomas A. DeChant, Mary Mohs, Zane Williams, Simon Anderson, David Mollenhoff, Leslie Schroeder, Dolores Grengg, Leigh Mollenhoff, Adam Plotkin, Paul Schoeneman, Dremock, Gene Devitt, Alex Hitch, Tom Link, Jim Skrentny, Michelle Martin, Peter Ostlind, Ledell Zellers, Fred Mohs, and Jason Tish. Registered neither support nor opposition was John Martens. Prior to the presentation staff requested that the applicant provide any and all materials not contained within the application packet, including the PowerPoint and computerized graphics presentation. Luskin noted abstention from consideration of the item. Supple provided an overview of the project as a follow-up to the Commission's previous review. Supple noted her expectation for referral of the item to continue with the dialog on a complex approval process. She further noted the need to provide for a presentation and review of recent modifications to the project. Following Supple's presentation, Dunn provided details as to the building's architecture and site design issues. The combined presentation noted a downsized auto court; its alignment with the centerline of Wisconsin Avenue, along with the breaking up of large greenspaces within the public plaza area to be utilized for multi-use purposes. Other modifications were noted as follows:

- Reduced uplighting in favor of downlighting at the water.
- Current study and consideration of pulling back the podium building at the lake, in combination with its effect on mechanicals.
- Study reducing utility penthouse in combination with a tree species survey, as well as considerations for owner-occupied residential.

Following the presentation public testimony was as follows:

- Martens noted that the plans were incomplete and inconsistent and failed to provide a clear indication as to the extent of improvements existing and proposed as outlined within a handout. He said he would like to see a final more complete version of the plan with the need to understand the project requiring a referral. He further noted a need to provide a lot more detail on modifications to the original Edgewater, issues with extent of private space being sold versus public; really a loss of public space where the project has significant differences between what's being claimed versus what's being shown.
- Plotkin spoke in opposition noting the Urban Design Commission's purpose and intent according to Madison General Ordinances to protect and to improve the general appearance of all buildings; he doubts the projects reflects improvements; to foster civic pride; the project doesn't foster civic pride; project eliminates a hill and effects the beauty of the Mansion Hill area.

Continued support and opposition were noted as follows:

- Support sustainable aspects, adopt reuse of existing buildings as well as an update of infrastructure with more for certain utilities.
- Oppose issue with noting area is blighted, lack of address of UDC's previous concerns, as well as inconsistency with 50-foot height limit within the R6H zoning district and the need to compromise.
- Reminded of recent projects that met the 50-foot height requirement within the area including the one that there should be an 8-foot setback from the walk as other buildings along Wisconsin Avenue, as well as to provide for changes that protect from the loss of the view of the lake.
- Object to representation of the Capitol Neighborhoods, Inc. voicing of opposition.
- Needs to respect Capitol views, provide true public access.
- Emphasize that the development will change an area within a historic districts that features 14 historic homes in the vicinity, as well as previous projects that met the height restrictions of the underlying R6H zoning.
- Support a worthwhile complex building. Need more intense development to offset cost of renovating the 40's building.
- Tish, representing the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation noted his appreciation for proposed improvements to the old building but concerned with violation of zoning, height restrictions and provisions of the Mansion Hill Historic District. He further noted the building is way out of scale with other buildings (2-3 stories), the scale of providing 100 rooms will have a detrimental effect to the livability of the historic district where there needs to be a compromise on scale.
- In favor of opportunity to make a first class hotel a beautiful addition to the city and lake.
- Project is so large at such a scale will totally change Mansion Hill. Will bring in traffic and ruin walkability of area.
- Ostlind spoke in support of renovations that would reinvigorate the Edgewater Hotel but recommended rejection based on impacts of height as it effects zoning, the historic district and the area as a whole.
- Packet missing much information: loading of trucks, drop-off and detailing on private drive and traffic flow. The elevation of plaza doesn't truly detail viewshed as proposed improvements are much higher than the current view.
- The public space at the front of the 40's building dense and gated, not public.
- The use of public space/right-of-way for private use not good use of public space.
- Height and mass doesn't fit the urban context, the area around the hotel is small scale residential.
- View from lakeside massive, out of scale, will encourage other developers to develop more intensely in historic districts. Need to stick to the provisions of the PUD ordinance. Urban context is a residentially

zoned neighborhood, project is a negative because of the size and mass. The project should be required to meet the same setback as the National Guardian Life building.

- Views should be maintained consistent with the vacation ordinance, not violated. Project will encourage other developers to assemble properties and develop inconsistent with requirements for the area.
- The neighborhood has had no opportunity to meet and react to the current plans as proposed.

Following public testimony the Commission noted the following:

- Still need to provide a response to viewshed perspective information as previously requested.
- Provide a coherent argument on the need to exceed height limit or make performance public to be able to evaluate.
- Project is an improvement on what is there. The open space between buildings better. How can space open up, to who and when? The reduction in drop-off good. The open stair is positive but concern with width of stair; need to be splayed to open up.
- The restoration of the 40's building is good; pulling back the 70's building is also good.
- The skywalks need more work, not transparent enough to provide view to lake.
- Make space that fronts lake be public.
- Concern with height, precedent it provides, not always this project but projects to follow suit.
- Needs greater setback of building face to property line as it relates to Wisconsin Avenue.
- Building of this height needs to be really something special, more dynamic, needs to distinguish itself if it's that prominent of a building.
- Provide traffic based answers.
- Needs to feel like a more cohesive project, tower needs to relate to each other, look at urban core where massing helps create a sense of place. The tower floats but doesn't feel grounded in its location. Needs stronger ties architecturally between all three buildings.
- Need to capture the feel of the original 40's building. Peel more off the 70's building, provide real public access where the stair is still too narrow it will be shadowed and won't succeed to create a cool sense of space.
- Provide specific details on proposed residential dwelling units.
- Need more detail on podium addition.
- Question how will project look if it met all requirements?
- If TIF funding is utilized justify what we are getting.
- Encourage the developer to have more neighborhood meetings.
- The stairway needs to be done in coordination with a shadow pattern study; concern with ability to grow plants within this area.
- Show tower mass and height from other views on lake, for example the Memorial Union.
- Concern with creating a large mass on lake that doesn't benefit from neighboring large scale landscaping or the setback that is provided within the adjacent National Guardian Life building.
- Question status of DNR approvals for the water feature as well as lakefront setback issues. Need to know in order to consider approval of the project.
- The northerly corner of the podium building is too close to the lake, round off.
- Horizontally the horizontality of the original 40's tower in concept and not quite as built, needs to be carried over to the design of the new tower.
- Need traffic study that deals with vehicle queuing and large vehicle template. Need more information on stormwater control and other alternative on-site opportunities.
- Need to provide a shadow study.
- Need to provide a sunset study that deals with how the tower blocks other residences.

- Relevant to the tree survey, identify and evaluate by an arborist relative to the change in light levels and its effect on vegetation due to height of the towers.
- Need to justify height – too tall.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item to provide address of the above stated Commission's concerns and the following:

- At the request of Ald. Bridge Maniaci provide nightscape information such as lighting, safety at the stairway including specific design details of the stair. Address concerns on the adequacy of its width, the effect of an urban plaza in a recess of the 40's building including on adjoining properties.
- Address issues relevant to the effectiveness of landscaping on the subterranean level within the recessed stair, as well as qualifying the extent of residential condominium units and impact on the project's design, including bike rack design and the need to provide a substantial study on traffic impacts.
- Provide a more substantial improvement associated with the surface parking and build up over the exposed northerly driveway entry adjacent to the National Guardian Life property. Look at placing auto court and the extension of Langdon Street in conjunction with the proposed surface parking lot.

The motion was passed on a vote of (9-0-1) with Luskin abstaining.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 5, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 666 Wisconsin Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	6	5	5	-	5	6	6
	5	5	-	-	-	5	7	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6

General Comments:

- Potential is there for a great project. Issues to resolve: tower height, vehicular traffic, stairwell access to lighting, public access.
- Stairs too narrow – do sun/shadow/sunset study. Where is residential if included. Still need existing views from streets. What would building look like if historic district ordinance, Capitol view height limit, lakefront setback, were followed? Consider further shrinkage of 1970s building – from lake, on roof, next to Edgewater. Further elaboration needed of garden area – impact on existing Edgewater. Urge continued conversation with NGL to purchase additional land to allow shorter building height and create better views of lake if building is reoriented. Also move auto court off public space.
- Height not justified; splay stair for greater view?; architecture might draw from context or really be a spectacular element on “skyline.”
- Why did I sign up for this? I need perspective views as previously described and a scale model with context would be a big help. DNR approval.