

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: August 17, 2011

TITLE: 1102 South Park Street – PUD(GDP-SIP) for a Four-Story Commercial Building and Parking Structure in UDD No. 7. 13th Ald. Dist. (22565)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: August 17, 2011

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 17, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1102 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Chuck Ghidorzi, and Allan Fish, representing the University of Wisconsin. Appearing in support but not wishing to speak was Lindsey Lee. Appearing in support and available to answer questions were Neil Feldt, representing the University of Wisconsin; and Chris Ghidorzi. Registered and speaking in opposition was Ron Shutvet. Ghidorzi presented changes to the plans which include a canopy out to Park Street, removal of the entry off of South Park Street, creating enough area for an ambulance, reserving an area on Fish Hatchery Road for a future building, better pedestrian and vehicular connections and more green areas. Fish presented scenarios for parking and circulation.

Shutvet spoke to the Commission, wondering why this could not be built with at least one floor of parking underground. He spoke of an Indian trail that was underneath this property and the historic nature of the area. His 1901 map of the area shows it as 50-feet above lake level with Indian mounds; not marshes. There is not a former marsh under this property so he does not understand why the applicant states ground water issues or the soils are contaminated.

Ald. Ellingson responded that she had never heard of the previous history of this piece of property. She stated there is a tremendous amount of neighborhood support for this project. It’s not a perfect project but it’s a really good project and it fits in with the other nearby uses.

Rummel inquired about parking under the building. Ghidorzi responded that borings done show groundwater at between 8-13 feet; also buried in this area are cinders used in production of electricity, any program in place for removal means it has to be taken to a landfill at their expense. She asked for further explanation of the surface parking lot. He replied that they want employee parking off of the employee door; that was a requirement of the tenant. It is also convenient for patient drop-off and parking. Rummel stated she has a hard time with this much surface parking for employees. She would lean toward this being greenspace until future buildings are erected. Fish stated that this is a criteria set by the clinic; in order to convince them to stay in the City they wanted

employee parking in a lot with good visibility to the employee entrance. Rummel commented that they would send their customers into an “insecure” space but they themselves can’t. Also at issue is the pharmacy employees and hours of operation; pharmacists leaving in the dark with a perceived security issue.

Huggins commented that she struggles with the surface parking lot and in good conscience could not approve a surface parking lot at this location. She pointed out that previous design solutions that were originally thought of as not possible have been accommodated, i.e. pushing out farther to Park Street. She suggested finding a safety solution that does not put a giant surface parking lot on Fish Hatchery Road.

Barnett commented that this process would have gone faster and smoother if the Ghidorzi engineers and architects came to the meeting. A dialogue with all of these people would lessen what gets lost in the translation. He also requested elevations and floor plans in order to answer his questions about perspectives and materials. Harrington wondered about the possibility of retail as supported in the adopted plans. Rummel commented that the design of the building is good, the Park Street side is interesting but the Fish Hatchery side fails. She wondered if the doctors needing a surface parking lot is really the big issue, can they do some underground parking with direct linkage? Ghidorzi replied that they have not looked at a private secure underground parking area for employees only.

Tim Parks of Planning Division staff talked about the concerns of the Planning Division. The parking deck is of concern, and many iterations have been drafted between Planning, Engineering and the applicant. Wagner inquired about putting conditions on the parking structure and counts; Parks was unsure that the City, from the Urban Design Commission to the Common Council, could do that. The Planning Division is willing to allow some surface parking because of the development potential on the rest of the site. Parks further stated that both Traffic and Planning staff strongly encourage the Urban Design Commission to not only permit access along Park Street but to accentuate it because of what is going to occur to the north. Steven Cover, Director of the Department of Planning and Community & Economic Development stated that TIF money would be more viable for the second iteration of the structured parking rather than the first. Rummel inquired about greening up the surface parking lot and decreasing the number of stalls. Fish replied that they have already removed one row of parking to install a significant row of buffer between the curb and the surface parking on Fish Hatchery Road. Barnett asked the developer to look further at the pedestrian connections. He suggested looking at where the crosswalk is relative to the handicapped parking stalls and aligning it with the island. O’Kroley remarked that the revised rendering of the stair she highly recommends; the last elevation was more graceful. She found the parking ramp proportions clearly much improved. She inquired about their stormwater management plans; Ghidorzi responded that JSD Professional Services is handling that with an initial plan already submitted to the Planning Division.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-2-1) with Slayton and O’Kroley voting no and Lufler abstaining. The motion provided for the following:

- Provide elevations.
- Study how the parking structure and Park Street entry address the street.
- Study and provide more information about rain garden or other stormwater management plans, including screening along Fish Hatchery Road.
- Look at pedestrian connectivity and crossing through the site and adjacent development.
- Look at radii for all the corners and maybe try to decrease them to slow traffic.
- Submit floor plans.

- Study canopy in making sure it will achieve its objective.
- Look at ways of reducing the number of surfaced parking stalls, incorporating more greenspace.
- Look at treating the parking garage architecturally in a similar vocabulary as the building.
- Bring some ideas of where signage is going to be placed.
- Address bicycle and moped parking.
- Study where your accessible parking stalls are located.

A previous motion by Slayton, seconded by Lufler for initial approval failed on a vote of (2-5) with Slayton and Lufler in favor, and Barnett, Rummel, O’Kroley, Harrington and Huggins against.

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 4, 5, 5, 5 and 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1102 South Park Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	4	6	6	-	-	4	5	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	4	6	5	-	-	4	4	4
	5	6	6	-	-	5	5	5

General Comments:

- Too suburban and does not address South Park Street in a clear and positive way.
- A on Park Street, F on Fish Hatchery. Want the clinic and infill but not at expense of Fish Hatchery. 50 staff can determine 50 years of land use. Rethink the circulation of the ramp and add more greenspace on Fish Hatchery.
- Make this an urban project.