

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> November 2, 2005	
TITLE: 1 University Square – PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development	<b>REFERRED:</b>	
	<b>REREFERRED:</b>	
	<b>REPORTED BACK:</b>	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b>	<b>POF:</b>
DATED: November 2, 2005	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>	

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner – Chair, Todd Barnett, Michael Barrett, Cathleen Feland, Lisa Geer, Lou Host-Jablonski, Robert March, Jack Williams, and Ald. Noel Radomski

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of November 2, 2005, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP) of a mixed-use redevelopment and PUD(SIP) for the existing operation and function of the “University Square Mall” on property located at 1 University Square.

Appearing on behalf of the project were Eric Lawson, Rick Gilbertsen, Greg Rice, Michael Duhr, Mark Bastian, Susan Springman and Julie Grove. Wagner abstained and was excused during consideration of this item with Lou Host-Jablonski acting as Chair. The Urban Design Commission needs to make a finding on the Planned Unit Development district (PUD) criteria for Downtown Design Zone Two in which the mixed-use project is located. The development of an 11-story University office tower and 12-story student housing facility including underlying retail and parking levels, requires a finding by the Urban Design Commission that the Exterior and Interior Design Criteria for Planned Unit Development Districts in Downtown Design Zones be addressed. In the case of the PUD-GDP as proposed an emphasis is placed on the provision relative to “Exterior Building Design.” The PUD-SIP component under co-consideration merely provides for the maintenance of the existing University Square facility pending future phased redevelopment of the project currently under consideration.

Eric Lawson, architect, distributed to the Commission a simplified breakdown of the provisions for the exterior/interior design criteria that were addressed with the PUD-GDP as proposed as well as the provisions to be addressed with future consideration of the overall PUD-SIP. He further elaborated on the specific provisions for exterior building design in Downtown Design Zones provided with the project with a review of massing studies, typical section diagrams, and site plan details. He further emphasized to the Commission that it must make a finding with approval of the PUD-GDP that the design criteria is addressed in providing for the two additional stories on the residential and office tower components, the general building and block massing, the private sidewalk treatment, the trash and off-street loading zone arrangement, including structured parking, as well as the University Avenue, Lake and Johnson Streets treatment.

Following the presentation, the discussion by the Commission emphasized the following:

- The sum of bike and moped parking should be provided at a level of 80% of the proposed residential units and be provided indoors.
- Concerns were raised with the mass of the building as it addresses its University Avenue frontage.

- Concern with what’s going on at the pedestrian level.
- The Downtown Design Zone requirements emphasize quality of design at the pedestrian level.
- The plans appear very flat. It appears that the Commission must take faith that there is going to be great features at the pedestrian level. Details which appear in shadows and are not defined include the following:
  - The plans do not address the criteria relevant to Building Components of which requires that lower level should be sufficiently detailed to “ground the building.”
  - The plans, as presented, do not address the provisions relevant to, Articulation, which requires that well articulated buildings add architectural interest and variety to the massing of a building and help break up long monotonous facades.
- As part of a previous informational presentation on this item, the applicant was requested to provide for a variation in facade and setback treatment along University Avenue, as well as entryway treatment for street side tenant spaces. The plans, as presented, do not address this request.
- The plans, as presented, do not provide the necessary level of detail and quality facade referenced within the Downtown Design Zone Criteria for Exterior Building Design.
- Details that provide for a variety of street facades will help the Commission in determining that the Downtown Design Zone Criteria have been met.
- We are being asked to pass judgment on an extraordinary design that justifies the top two floors without seeing extraordinary design as required within the criteria for bonus stories in Downtown Design Zone Two. The project presents a rich and wonderful possibility for great architecture.
- The articulation of the program almost leads you in that direction, but we are not seeing it because the project is not at that level. Do we do a “faith-based approval” or an approval based on evidence?
- Don’t appear that the building design is there for us to be able to say that it meets the ordinance; it is of extraordinary design and therefore, be allowed to have two more stories.
- A discussion on specific design issues with the project were as follows:
  - The cooling tower atop the corner of the building (at University Avenue and Lake Street); is an opportunity which has not been resolved yet within the preliminary design. The potential corner element or tower has a possibility to be very strong and important. The articulation of the facade of the cooling tower is not clear, as well as its position and step back.
  - The expression of the two-story base could be very exciting two-story retail with interesting signage, and articulations of facade. The details are unclear.
  - So many options for potential architectural design for this project, which are not visible at this level.
  - The Commission is looking for distinguished architecture to justify the additional two stories.

In general, the Commission had difficulty discerning that the level of detail provided within the plans as proposed was sufficient to make a finding that the Criteria for Downtown Design Zone development, specifically the exterior building design was appropriately addressed to recommend final approval of the PUD(GDP) as proposed. A lengthy discussion between staff (Fruhling and Martin) and the Commission ensued relevant to the options for consideration of the project such as referral, with conditions, no action, conditional approval, and / or rejection. The Commission expressed its strong support for the project, but found it difficult

to grant final approval based on the requirements for exterior building design for development in Downtown Design Zones.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Barrett, seconded by March, the Urban Design Commission considered referral of the project due to the lack of sufficient information to recommend approval based on the ordinance requirements for development within Downtown Design Zones. The Commission expressed its general support for the general bulk and mass of the project. Discussion on the motion with staff emphasized issues with the applicant's need for a recommendation on the project as well as impacts on the approval process. On a motion by Barrett, seconded by March, the motion was withdrawn. Following further discussion with staff on a motion by March, seconded by Greer, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the PUD-GDP as presented with the following to be addressed for final approval of the PUD(GDP):

- The design criteria of the ordinance for the additional two stories.
- Distinguished treatment of the street level and tower level elements as well as the overall architecture of the building as articulated within the design criteria with an emphasis on providing extraordinary architecture with final consideration of the project.

The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0).

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 8, 8, 7, 7, 7, 7, 6.5, and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1 University Square**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	6	6	-	-	-	7	8	8
	6	5	6	-	-	6	8	7
	7	-	-	-	-	7	7	7
	5	6	-	-	-	8	7	6.5
	7	-	-	7	-	-	7	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	6	6	6	6	-	6	6	6
	8	7	7	7	-	9	9	8

General Comments:

- Love the organization of uses so far and the streetscape definition as it addresses the individual streets.
- Conceptually exciting. Potential for rich and lively architecture. However, these features are not worked out yet. Approval must be based on faith.
- Site somewhat overbuilt but basic concept OK.
- This project has great potential, but there is too much that is unanswered architecturally, particularly at the pedestrian level.
- Exciting, well thought out project.