

## AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> September 1, 2010
TITLE: 5117 University Avenue - PUD(GDP), Erdman Center Project/Mixed-Use Development. 19th Ald. Dist. (18094)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: September 1, 2010	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of September 1, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP) for the Erdman Center Project located at 5117 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Brian Munson, representing Erdman Real Estate; Jane Grabowski-Miller and Bill Suick, both representing the Erdman Development Group; and Shary Bisgard, representing the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association . Appearing in opposition to the project were Bill Fitzpatrick, representing the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association; and Michael Kienitz. Appearing neither in support nor opposition were Ald. Mark Clear, District 19; Sally Miley, and Janet Loewi, representing Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association. Munson reviewed the retail aspects of this project to create an active node beyond just offices, including the following:

- A greenspace/walking environment that exposes the retail aspect is their goal.
- There has been a realignment of the road as it winds through the site, including stopping vehicles at one point to slow them down. This creates a central parking area that is more efficient and reduces the parking demand on the edges.
- In terms of the park configurations, the linear park on the edge of the site has been increased to create a larger space near the intersection and preserves some of the trees.
- The buildings within this development will be 3-stories minimum, 6-stories maximum. The overall square footage remains the same on the maximum and is increased slightly on the minimum. The PSC building will be the benchmark for heights. They have also gone in on a lot-by-lot basis to plan how to transition the taller buildings in the center of the site and step down as it moves outward.
- They will be working with Madison Metro to place bus stops within the development, as well as working toward transit stations for possible future rail.
- Their goal is to have an architectural goal/code in place so that everyone who partners on the lots will have to go through a pre-design before they submit to the City process.
- They have hired URS to do a full phase one on the site for the wellhead protection. They have also added wellhead protection covenants from the Zoning Code to reinforce the importance of dealing with this.
- They have integrated the Spring Harbor Neighborhood’s design guidelines into the packet.

- They are in discussions with the City to look into TIF money for structured parking. He stated that the green architecture aspects of this project can't be determined at the GDP level.

Testimony from the public was as follows:

- Janet Loewi presented a handout representing the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association. The neighborhood is excited to have this area developed. The neighborhood continues, however, to be very concerned about the vagueness in the zoning text, particularly the lot descriptions that need to be tied to the preliminary plat. They would also like more definition for minimum and maximum floor to area ratio and yard setbacks.
- Bill Fitzpatrick spoke about parking and building height. Parking as it relates to stormwater management and the currently underused parking areas that generate a lot of run-off. He is encouraged with more emphasis on the greenspace and is excited about the potential of redeveloping this blighted area. However, he would like to see a guarantee that structured parking will indeed be provided so that buildings don't go up and they end up with a sea of asphalt parking. While he approves of the variation of building heights, he would like the Commission to look at building heights in conjunction with the site topography.
  - Munson replied that the site slopes from the PSC downward along University Avenue. There are several points where there will be more than a floor of grade change incorporated into the buildings. Their intent is to do 95-feet, or 6-stories. Fitzpatrick reiterated his desire to see the tallest buildings using the lowest lots.
- Shary Bisgard spoke about the Trillium development that abuts the Erdman property. There is concern about the development of taller, more dense buildings right next to this neighborhood of one-story, single-family homes. They would like to see tall, dense screening. They would also like something other than blank walls on the concrete parking structure. They would like to be able to save the mature trees already on this development site. One thing they definitely do not want to see is commuter parking in this location for rail transit. They do not want outside vehicles flooding the neighborhood for commuter parking.

Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- Need a trigger point to provide for structured parking beyond the surface parking shown on Page 36 (application packet).
- Provide a stronger connection with linear park and neighborhood.
- Need a phasing plan that addresses the development of structured parking and infrastructure.
- Try to create some visual connection from the bike path and people driving on University Avenue.
- Think of the site in terms of phases. That will also give the neighbors some sense of how it's going to develop.
- Still concerned with the specificity of the building heights relative to the lots. Specifically Lots 3, 4 and 5; it would be reasonable and beneficial if there were a height limit specified for those lots. Something like 75-80-feet seems more reasonable.
- Lake Forest graphic doesn't mesh with the amount of surface parking; need some sense of what project will look like.
- The neighborhood is very concerned about building heights and parking. There needs to be a description or detailing with regard to the height of the buildings and the density and location of at least some of the parking, it's going to be very hard to sell the project.

- I want to know more about the project wellhead protection provisions.
  - Munson replied that only when we get a clean phase 2 that the DNR and says you have met your environmental obligation can we move forward with the banks. So we take very seriously the remediation and possibilities of contamination. This is a statutory process that we will be doing. We're also working with the City on the stormwater management plan. We will meet all the filtration and volume control issues in terms of stormwater runoff.
- Provide information on proposed uses and trigger points.
- Need to see what threshold of development will tip structured parking.
- Happy to see that architectural style is not mandated in the zoning text. I would like to see some architectural language for the parking structure.
- No more than twelve consecutive parking stalls without tree islands; need more landscaping for surface parking lots.
- Consider keeping one-third of surface parking green until building build-out occurs.
- Parking lot at the corner of University Avenue and Whitney Way needs attention, can live with adjacent surface parking along both streets but reduce parking in the area.
- The corner is the "fulcrum" of the site, should be treated as entry at University Avenue. Eliminate drive at Whitney near corner and eliminate the "triangle" of asphalt.
- No pedestrian connectivity through the center of the site.
- The spatial arrangement between Lots 7, 12 and 11 needs work.
- Encourage lower level parking below buildings to reduce surface parking.
- Question staffs' read on the project (necessary for further consideration).
- Page 31 is a zoning document up for approval with no restrictions of what happens with the edge condition.
- No connections or grids clearly defined with the GDP that show how things clearly connect.
- You've got such a great opportunity and I think you've realized it here. There's an opportunity here for efficiency of asphalt so you get more greenspaces.
- Your comparison to the Beltline should stop tonight because this isn't the Beltline; it's Hilldale, way more special than the Beltline.
- Connectivity through the site is a big deal. It has to have a sense of place.
- Lots 7, 12 and 11 – spatially it looks like IHOP.
- From a marketing standpoint, it would be extremely beneficial to incorporate some underground parking.
- What I feel is missing from your site plan is that your grid needs to be in there. There needs to be a legible way to connect between all of these various lots as a secondary means of communication for people. I'm uncomfortable with that lack of connection.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Lufler, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion required address of the above stated concerns and the Planning staff report that clarifies all issues to be prepared at minimum in draft form with any further consideration of the project.

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 5, 5, 5.5 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 5117 University Avenue**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	5	-	-	-	-	4	5	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.5
	6	-	-	-	-	6	6	6
	5	-	-	-	-	4.5	5	5

General Comments:

- Sense of place throughout site is needed. Outlot 3 is exemplary. Ped connectivity through side is extremely important.
- Coming together. But significant concerns about parking/parking garage and corner treatment.
- Focus on University Avenue frontage and triangle intersection; need a big idea, it's missing. Need plan for parking structure triggers. Need more info on impact on wellhead and protecting aquifer. Not ready for GDP because pieces missing at University and Whitney Way corner area – some good ideas = linear park, internal street.
- Building heights a concern. Need more specific language please. Architecture guidelines for Lot 12 parking structure are needed, must be better than typical parking structure.
- Density is positive, increase visual and pedestrian connectivity. Lot 11 is key and must anchor the site and reinforce street edge on University, no parking on University on Lot 11. Provide a phasing plan including surface, underground and structured parking. Indicate greenspace and intent of greenspace to encourage pedestrian and visual connectivity.
- Interior street is conceptually interesting. Outside street frontage is not. Corner at Whitney Way and University needs stronger anchor and less pavement.