

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** May 21, 2008

TITLE: Accepting the Proposal of Common
 Wealth Development for the
 Redevelopment of the Garver Feed Mill
 and Directing City Staff to Negotiate a De
 Agreement with Common Wealth
 Development. (09785)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 21, 2008

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bonnie Cosgrove, Marsha Rummel, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Todd Barnett and Bruce Woods.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 21, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED ACCEPTANCE** of the proposal of Common Wealth Development for the redevelopment of the Garver Feed Mill. Appearing on behalf of the project were Marianne Morton, representing Common Wealth Development, and Paul Jasenski. Dan Rolfs, of the Real Estate Services Division of the Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development, along with Marianne Morton, Ed Morton representing Common Wealth Development, Inc. and Paul Jasenski spoke in support of favor of the resolution of accepting the report relevant to the "Garver Art Facility." The resolution supports the concept that Common Wealth Development, Inc. moving forward in regards to redevelopment of the Garver Feed Mill, its reuse and rehabilitation.

Prior to the presentation Ald. Rummel noted her request for UDC consideration and referral based on properties public ownership as well as the project's emphasis on parking and restoration and rehabilitation of historic buildings. The project as presented emphasized its use as an arts incubator site in a historic building along with a commitment to make a sustainable green development. A review of the details of the development plan and including interior floor plans and concepts for rehabilitation and renovation of the building's exterior were emphasized, including parking issues, in addition to a commitment to a future roof garden in the second phase due to funding issues.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Provide tree islands at a 12-stall interview along with bringing public art into the parking lot and with the inclusion of bioswales.
- The inclusion of bioswales, decorative screens, and sculpture such as moving water features in the bioswales area.
- Consider utilizing the Kessinich's driveway entrance as an alternative to the on-sight proposal.
- Qualify existing landscaping around parking area to be maintained and planted with an emphasis to save desirable trees in the parking area.

- Look at arrangement of bays to facilitate pedestrian circulation; turn 90 degrees so drive aisles are parallel and lead to building.
- Next time provide more context with the neighborhood and adjacent Olbrich Gardens including providing pedestrian linkages with Olbrich Gardens.
- Like to see what could be done in terms of landscaping development with south face of the building in terms of public space and incorporation of bioswale combined with a scaling back of the north side plaza.

As a follow-up to the presentation it was generally noted that this was a great project. Unfortunate that the building has deteriorated as far as it is.

ACTION:

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED ACCEPTANCE**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion to accept cited address of the above-stated concerns with further consideration of the redevelopment proposal.

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, 7 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: Garver Feed Mill-Common Wealth Development

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	7	-	-	-	-	-	9	-
	6	6	-	-	-	6	6	6

General Comments:

- Rotate parking bays 90 degrees to better accommodate pedestrian flow to building. Save specimen trees within parking as appropriate and practical/possible.
- Good luck. Look forward to seeing you next time.
- Very exciting.
- Great project! Consider rotating parking and adding art to connect the exterior and interior of the building.
- Great project and philosophy! Take the art outdoors.
- Accept proposal with hope for great things from project.