

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: February 17, 2010
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: February 17, 2010	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 17, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 666 Wisconsin Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Bob Dunn, Amy Supple and David Manfredi, representing Hammes Co.; Douglas Kozel, Gary Peterson, Juli Aulik, Ken Saiki, and Ald. Bridget Maniaci. Appearing in support but not wishing to speak were Steve Harms, Scott Faulkner, Dan Murray and James Tye. Appearing in support and available to answer questions was Mark Huber, representing BT Squared, Inc. Appearing in opposition and wishing to speak were John Martens, John Sheehan, Ledell Zellers, Kitty Rankin, Fred Mohs, Peter Ostlind, James McFadden and Gene Devitt. Appearing in opposition but not wishing to speak were Pat Sheldon, Fae Dremock and Jason Tish, representing the Madison Trust for Historic Preservation. Appearing neither in support nor opposition was Ald. Julia Kerr.

Dunn noted that new ideas to address issues were being put forth, questioned whether they would resolve the major concerns in order to proceed with a more finalized design, as well as provide for further direction on satisfying the Urban Design Commission's concerns. He stated that it is proposed to study carefully bringing upper floor over an additional 15-feet off of the Capitol View Corridor for a total of 81-feet off of the centerline of Wisconsin Avenue, along with the following:

- A redo of the parking structure across Langdon Street extended with the adjoining NGL property.
- Significant changes to the “public terrace” provides for improvements to the “public space.”
- A new parking deck below the NGL lawn featuring entering off and exiting onto of Langdon Street provides that the upper terrace is transformed from an auto court by removing a significant amount of auto traffic and converts it into a more pedestrian-oriented plaza.
- A relocated parking structure provides for an overall increase in parking from 265 spaces including 211 within the new structure on the NGL property.
- Architectural changes include modifications to the lakeside elevation to resolve the extending bay issue.
- Modifications to the east elevation include more glazing on top along with review of the various views of the loading dock, Langdon Street and east elevation perspectives.

Saiki proceeded with a review of site plan changes and issues noting the squeezing of the upper plaza with less of a drive but with fire access, along with the elimination of the ramp entry with the new design featuring a series of landscaped terraces and a center green panel/overlook.

Testimony from the public both in support and in opposition is as summarized:

- Good restoration project, good new projects, creates a new landmark with great public space.
- Make sure details of plans will bear out perception of lake view. Want UDC to feel information is appropriate and enough to make a decision.
- Need to discuss building height, mass, setback and parking issues more thoroughly.
- Changing times, setback and building height are numbers for a 30 year period of time that doesn't work today, need flexibility in setback. This is a visionary project. Setbacks are arbitrarily based on time.
- Changes make it a better project, need to lower plantings in setback.
- Need to examine podium portion of the addition's location within the setback.
- Need to examine bus loading and parking in the upper plaza.
- Project corrects 70's mistake.
- The grand stair is an inspired design.
- One remaining issue is height but can't evaluate setback without further examining it. Don't make a decision without more details, need to have time to look at in advance.
- Public needs opportunity to review changes, still concerned with height of tower, project requires referral.
- Need to resolve lakefront setback issue.
- Still concerned with bus queuing and deliveries.
- With the number of loading bays of two not sufficient when four would be conventionally required.
- The mass, volume and height inappropriate to what is around it, out of scale with Mansion Hill area.
- Last minute documents don't allow for absorbing of changes which are significant, lake view renderings are not accurate and need accurate and consistent information.
- Diagram in pass-out shows building can be moved 30-feet with building height not yet addressed.
- Concern with impacts on adjoining residential parcels with outdoor plazas as programmed. Each provided surveyed reference points to document building's proposed height.

Continued discussion by the Commission noted the following:

- A comment by Barnett noted it would be helpful if the architect and neighborhood and those in concern shared info on perspective renderings of the lake view to be on the same page or benchmark.
- Need to see accurate detailed renderings with details on the location of viewpoints and height of view.
- Need to provide specifics as to what lake view we are taking action on.
- The movement of the additional 15-feet, why not more?
- Thanks for the additional stormwater data.
- Renderings from the NGL property, the Wisconsin Avenue right-of-way and further down Langdon are important to provide.
- Show how parking garage fits on the NGL property.
- Glad to see changes from last, every time you come back a great improvement.
- Want to see more of Mansion Hill from the lakeside view for reference from the site east.

Ald. Maniaci spoke in support noting the need to provide information as to what needs to be done for initial approval based on recent changes by the applicant with the 15-foot additional setback referenced as a good compromise.

Continued discussion noted the following:

- Based on what we see just tonight, can't give initial. Need full site and building plans but can provide direction. Take time to get things done in order to see a more complete package that reflects everything that needs to be done.
- Question if the framework and shifting of the building and relationship on-site and how it affects architecture, and 15-foot movement is sufficient to resolve issues?
- In general, ideas about the plaza as presented are OK.
- Feedback on parking structure positive as a significant change to design.
- Thanks for the changes. Parking structure a good change in the right direction with no surface parking atop with incorporation of nice greenspace.
- Need to see street eye level perspective of parking structure, want to see the entry treatment and other details.
- On the mass of the façade of the building, hoped for a 30-foot movement, a positive step at 15-feet, reorient tower atop podium positive but look at adding more outdoor spaces.
- Appreciate the cost of surface versus structured parking, like what's being done setback works better project. Explore varying parking. The tread width at stair be a minimum of 10-feet in width, 15-foot wall to wall zone end of stair.
- Relevant to the landscape plan changes in the scoring pattern of the plaza needs work, use columnar trees in front plaza area.
- Setback may be comfortable but need to see how it relates to the plaza; is it still set up on a plinth? Need details.
- The project rectifies a 70's mistake.
- Deal with stair width issues.
- Less concern with activities in plaza, an urban condition.
- Like PC report providing clarity and resolved many issues.
- Like setback massing and composition improvements, no problem with this addition as layering in a historic district.
- TIF funding should provide for more preservation in this historic district.
- Application using height of the NGL building as a precedent to support height of the tower addition.
- City of Madison Comprehensive Plan notes that the underlying topography of the area should guide development where it would be more in keeping if lowered and set down toward the waterfront.
- The unresolved lakefront issues are a problem relevant to the dock.
- A reminder that the vantage point/viewpoint cross-sectional information requested in August should be provided as a tool to reflect all changes as proposed for further review.
- Consider a lower tower and elongated rooms for floors which might win more support on bulk and mass issue.
- The parking structure a huge step resolves many problems.
- Question if a 15-foot shift of the tower is sufficient, huge in the right direction.
- On architecture, stair width is OK; great if wider.
- Success will be based on a design which is not there yet with a creative solution; not seen. Provide renderings, need to be special, a feature, need to see what's on the walls.
- Loading dock is fine, but resolve issue with trash compactor.

- Provide information relative to whether or not the parking structure will hold the building addition atop.
- Building height still an issue, need to cascade toward the lake.
- On height, height of building in relationship to the historic district, placement as a site specific corner of building at Langdon should relate to the height of the Kennedy Manor at its cornice; the upper two levels above are still at issue including its setback and bulk.
- Lakeside elevation tower and plinth still floating, bring vertical thrust to ground to lake.
- Concern with penthouse treatment being boxy and not integrated as the architectural features of the rest of the façade.
- Provide bike/moped parking details, need to keep off the lower plaza.

An informal poll taken by Barnett relevant to issues as follows was as follows:

- Stairwell width, is space between buildings sufficient for a stair with the need to provide more details, supported unanimously.
- Relevant to the plaza elevations with removal of stories of 70s building and movement of tower, supported unanimously.
- The general concept of direction of the plaza design, public/semi-public, supported unanimously.
- General design of the upper plaza guest drop-off area, supported unanimously.
- The loading dock location with two loading bays, supported unanimously.
- Comfort with the general concept of the new setback, supported unanimously.
- New parking concept with entry of parking deck off Langdon, supported unanimously.
- Comfort with general direction of the architecture, supported unanimously but work hard on remaining issues.
- The issue of building height was noted as unresolved with no informal vote, with comments as follows:
 - Not comfortable with height of building, too tall, need additional details to further evaluate; still developing.
 - Not comfortable with height as is, could be five-stories.
 - Add two-four rooms of floor to trade-off on building height.
- Additional comments by the Commission noted the need to obtain feedback from the Fire Department on the plaza design as modified relevant to fire access in order to minimize the width of pavement.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Smith, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of the project to allow for the development of fully detailed plans and address of the above stated concerns prior to any further consideration of the project. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0-1) 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 6.5 and 8.

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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	6.5	-	5	6.5	-	-	7	6.5

General Comments:

- Last second information is not acceptable – what am I actually looking at? Applicant needs to simply submit a complete project design and documents. Tower is still too tall – add 2-4 rooms per floor and lower tower by one floor.
- Great step forward.
- Big improvement. Setback/parking solutions thumbs up!
- Excellent progress. Thank you.