

**AGENDA # 4**

City of Madison, Wisconsin

**REPORT OF:** URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** July 6, 2011

**TITLE:** 5105-5117 University Avenue & 610-702 North Whitney Way – PUD(GDP-SIP) and Demolition Permit for a Mixed-Use Development with Seven New Buildings and Three Parking Structures. 19<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (22701)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** William A. Fruhling, Acting Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** July 6, 2011

**ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Melissa Huggins and Henry Lufler.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of July 6, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 5105-5117 University Avenue and 610-702 North Whitney Way. Appearing on behalf of the project were Doug Hursh, representing Krupp Construction; Mary Beth Dunning, representing Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Paul Lenhart, the property owner; and Dan Day, representing D’Onofrio Kottke & Associates. Registered and speaking in opposition was Amy Kinast. Registered neither in support nor opposition and available to answer questions were Jason Tish, representing Madison Trust for Historic Preservation; and Greg Hull, president of the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association. Hursh presented changes to the plans which include wrapping the parking structure with housing on three sides to increase the housing count from 32 to 64 units. It also includes creating more of an internal street, with a reduction in parking by 50 stalls for an overall parking ratio of 2.83 per thousand square feet. They had a neighborhood meeting since their last meeting with the Commission where they talked about green spaces and edges. Landscaping and greenspaces have been tweaked to be more pedestrian-friendly with a 30-foot buffer on the Trilium side to maintain the screening. Hursh presented multiple photos of street and building elevations as well as various perspectives and cross-sections. Lenhart spoke about reducing the number of parking stalls and the uses and times those parking spots will be used. They believe they can get by with less stalls because of the varied uses of these spots during the day and the nighttime hours.

Mary Beth Dunning spoke on behalf of the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Board, presenting ten recommendations with actions for this proposed project (copies distributed). These recommendations include concerns about building heights and viewsheds, how building design and placement will affect how the noise is transferred to the surrounding neighborhoods, stormwater and run-off issues, as well as air and soil quality. The neighborhood association is pleased with the plans to develop the site and appreciates Krupp working with them to address these issues.

Amy Kinast spoke against the demolition at 5107 University because of the historic nature of the building. She is in the process of completing a landmarks nomination form for this building. Slayton mentioned that there are numerous additions to the building and asked if there was a specific part of the building she was interested in. She replied that the state believes that everything that is contiguous to that building is of potential historic importance. Barnett inquired who should purchase and occupy this building and Kinast replied she thought an architecture firm would be best but is not the one to determine future use.

Greg Hull inquired about the view of the Capitol from Old Sauk Road and how that might be affected by this project. Hursh responded that they will be looking at that more specifically.

Huggins appreciated the stronger version of housing that accomplishes what the Commission wanted to see and is supportive of the heights proposed. She does not feel that the PSC building is well integrated into the site. Barnett believes this is coming along nicely. Day stated that because there is such potential use along the proposed streets with two different property owners, it makes sense for this to be more of a public roadway. Barnett wondered about the success of the space near the back, that it seems a little bit lost. He is glad to see that they have come up with a couple of options to address the noise concerns and suggested studying new technology of a rain screen wall combined with the simple technology of open cell blocks. O'Kroley praised the proportions and street sections, and the attention paid to the public space between the hotel and the building on University Avenue. Harrington suggested prairie grasses rather than trees for certain areas of the landscape plan for the initial build-out. Slayton stated that the whole area near the corner of University Avenue and Whitney Way is critical and suggested the developer pay very close attention to it. He also talked about the importance of maintaining the view from Old Sauk Road. Smith talked about utilizing the rooftop on the residential portion or the possibility of French balconies. He would like to see views from Old Sauk Road to the Capitol building as well. Alder Clear stated that he supports all of the neighborhood's recommendations except the hotel height, which he thinks is OK, pending further study of views from Old Sauk Road toward the Capitol.

### **ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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 6, 7 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 5001-5117 University Avenue & 610-702 North Whitney Way**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	8	-	7	-	-	7	7	-
	6	-	-	-	-	6	8	7
	6	6	-	-	-	6	7	6

General Comments:

- Revised plan responds well to items noted for study; concerned about late notice for historical status.
- Nice progression! Maintain the green.
- Excellent refinements. Corner treatment at University & Whitney is important: explore further. View of Capitol building from Old Sauk Road must be maintained. Queuing of light rail must be considered.