

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> October 6, 2010
TITLE: 5117 University Avenue – PUD(GDP), Erdman Center Project/Mixed-Use Development. 19 <sup>th</sup> 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: October 6, 2010	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of October 6, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP) located at 5117 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Frank Miller, Jane Grabowski-Miller, Bill Suick, Jon Snowden and Alan Hembel, all representing Erdman Development Group; and Ald. Mark Clear, representing the 19<sup>th</sup> District. Registered neither in support nor opposition as Janet Loewi, representing the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association. Miller presented revised plans that address the comments and concerns of the Commission’s previous review of the project. He distributed a list of changes to the GDP documents. Key changes highlighted in the new plans focus on the corner area of Whitney Way and University Avenue has been reconfigured with the creation of a conceptual building with a stronger presence on the corner and addresses the intersection better. There are fewer parking spaces, and a right-in/right-out lane as encouraged by Traffic Engineering, and better and more complete network of sidewalks for getting around that corner. Another major change near the plaza are longer drive lanes to accommodate stacking. Outlot 4 will remain a private open greenspace, with reconfiguring of Outlot 1 to be maintained as greenspace. He addressed concerns regarding phasing; the first phase is a clinic on Lots 1 and 2, a hospitality hotel-like building, existing PSC building and retaining most of the parking ramp used for the PSC. The second phase would include Lots 10 and 11 for surface parking with structured parking underneath all the lower levels of the projects, with the possible exception of the restaurant site as it may be too small. As part of this phase the building pads for Lots 7, 8, 9 and 3 would remain unbuilt on, which reduces the amount of asphalt on the site and preserves those building pads as real building pads that don’t get swallowed up by parking. The third phase shows development on Lots 2 and 3 with structured parking behind it, and phase 4 which would include the development of Lots 7, 8, 9 and 5, none of which can be developed without structured parking. There is also the possibility for a grocery store. The parking around the edges of the site becomes less shared and more dedicated to the uses in those buildings. He presented elevational drawings to address the concerns about grade and building heights. He pointed out that from the linear park with bike paths and pedestrian access, the west end is one level up to Erdman Center Drive, and following that it’s one more level up to Whitney Way. They have also combined all the lot information on one page, including views, parking ratios, the size of the lot in square feet, the minimum height in stories and the maximum height in stories, the approximate footprint, the approximate minimum and maximum square footage, and the minimum and maximum parking associated with each lot. The total square footage is slightly less in terms of new development. There are now 20-foot drive lanes as requested by Traffic

Engineering with landscaping and monument signs added, as well as improving pedestrian access along University Avenue. Their intent is to have some variation in building heights.

Janet Loewi reiterated the feelings and concerns of the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association. She remarked on the zoning text that refers to the development as one giant lot; they want to see it broken up into multiple lots. They also feel that the floor area ratio still isn't defined, and maximum and minimum building heights need clarification. They would like certain items taken off the list of permitted uses, i.e. public utility and public services uses. These don't seem appropriate for a healthcare and service-oriented development. They do not have a future meeting with developers set up at this time.

Ald. Mark Clear, District 19 spoke, thanking the developer for the phasing plan, and an explanation as to when structured parking becomes required. The Comprehensive Plan calls for this area to be transit-oriented development. He feels that the developers have now come up with a concept plan that shows they are interested and willing to do this. The commuter rail aspect is more difficult because there are no clear plans for that at this time. He feels these are good additions to the submittal and feels that the developer has reviewed and acknowledged the Commission's previous concerns and questions.

Questions and comments from the Commission were as follows:

- Thank you for all the changes.
- Looks like the parking ratio of stalls to square footage is roughly the City standard. I encourage you to look at transportation plans as development occurs and encourage or require each developer of each parcel to look at ways to reduce parking with the result of more open space.
- Create an accessible route for building on Lot 10 without using public walk at street.
- Pull buildings on Lots 1 and 10 more towards the street.
- On Lot 7, hotel site instead of parking by the street with building setback combine with drop-off need; firm up.
- Thank you for the cross-section, that helps understand the site much more.
- Can you tell us on the plan if and where there will be retaining walls that will prohibit accessibility? It would be nice to see an accessible route integrated with the site proper.
  - There is some additional room and maybe there's a way to design it such that it doesn't feel like you have to go all the way out to the street.
- Pierce retaining wall at surface parking lot between Lots 10 and 11.
- You may want to look at perpendicular stalls for greater efficiency.
- You might think about pulling that greenspace and put the parking where people will come in, which will provide additional space where people walk along the edge and activates that space.
- It might be nice to see something more substantial or have these buildings pull a little more to the street so there's an edge to it.
- The one-story building at the corner – what is the reasoning for that?
  - The restaurant group that we're talking with is considering a 2-story building. We'd like a strong presence here. Our hope is that it's a restaurant on the first floor and office on the second floor. Out instinct is to try and get that up to at least 2 floors.
- The Whitney Way/University Avenue corner is a huge improvement. I'm not sure it's totally there but it's a lot better.
- You need cross connections to the greenspace.
  - We've shown at least one connection and there could be more. It needs to be coordinated with the parking.
- I'm feeling much more comfortable now with what you've got going.

- Who is going to use Outlot 4? It's so tucked away back there; obscure open space. Question usability and use for stormwater.
  - To some extent, the programming of it is unclear at this point. All we know is that the neighbors have encouraged us to increase the amount of greenspace. Originally we envisioned this as a public park but the City doesn't want the responsibility of it. It hasn't been drawn with any detail other than green grass. We want that view termination to be something exciting but not urban.

I think that needs to be looked at again.

- All the parallel parking you have along the street, it would be nice to see some bump-outs to break that up and give it a more intimate feel.
- Some of the uses you have listed here, such as water pumping stations, why are some of these included?
  - They're in there because in general we're trying to find the flexibility that makes sense for the economic opportunities, as well as the expectations of the neighbors, so we're open to adjusting that list.

It seems to me it's not something that's going to be an asset to the neighborhood.

We agree.

- Come back with parking ratios; we'd rather see them lower than higher.
- Design elements and most everything I'm seeing here is looking internally to your site, but this is an area that has the potential to rejuvenate University Avenue; need to look at external elements as development relates to the street edge. I'd encourage you to look up and down University and Whitney Way and make that edge better. I like what you've done with the restaurant to engage those two areas.
  - My hope is that the presence of the building on Lot 11 could be a long view termination.
- Thanks for Lot 11.
- I prefer the diagonal with the one-way system. Sentry at Hilldale suffers because they changed theirs and it's confusing.
- If you have infiltration it would be nice to see these parking stalls in pervious materials.
- I love that this is a tribute to the Erdman sculpture. Don't just discard it.
- The creation of this perimeter path is not successful in creating some connectivity for the site.
- Your perimeter issues with the neighborhood properties have to be resolved with appropriate setbacks.
- Don't create a sidewalk that is somehow shared with the City, I don't think that's appropriate.
- This is a very successful urban place within this site; this is a little suburban to me. If you somehow widen this plaza and streetscape it gives you a connection to the urban sense on the site.
- It would be nice to integrate your greenspace more.
- Regarding the minimum and maximum heights – in addition to the heights being described as stories, you add in feet, an actual dimension. I suggest for the minimum you use 12-feet for your story or floor, and 16-feet for your max, so for example maximum of four stories, or 64 feet. You could say the building heights are measured from the lowest point of each lot, such that we would have some kind of assurance that as the site steps down or up, the buildings would do likewise.
  - Lot 10 seems to be the building that has the most mixed-use pressures on it, with the grade change. For example, if there was retail on the first floor, the numbers you threw out make perfect sense. If a grocery store occupied the space on the second floor...

So the idea is you use the 12 or 16 feet just to set the minimum or maximum height. You're not restricting the floors to that dimension, it's just another definition of how high that particular building could be on that particular lot. It becomes an either or. That guarantees that things "step" properly around the site. They should look at the way the City counts this in case it is different than how you've just described.

- Thank you for the elevations.
- I'm curious about where the housing might go and what kind of housing it might be.

- We're thinking something like the Ronald McDonald House, which is technically "hospitality" and not housing. This is the most residential-like thing at the moment. Adjacent to that would be my first guess that would be most appropriate for some residential. One approach is a completely residential building, and another is to have something on top. That's about as much as we know now.
- Keep the parking ratios down.
- Nice work. My only concern would be, when I see this large shared parking structure in the center, will it look like a large shared parking structure, will you screen that?
  - Our design guidelines address that. It's our intention that your first impression will be as positive as possible. Having a bland parking ramp as a backdrop to these buildings doesn't seem to accomplish that goal.
- How long does Erdman oversee this – who succeeds, and how to we make sure your interest is an on-going interest?
  - The quick answer is that a property owner's association would be created to own and manage all the private open space. That group would also administer and enforce the design code. May need to be specified at the Plan Commission level of approval.
- With each SIP we're going to want to see the progress on how you are working toward the shared parking issues.
- We need some larger context on your greenspace links and how that works.
- The uses I think is a Plan Commission issue.
- If you can on the revised plan acknowledge tree islands every 10-12 spaces.
- I'm really intrigued about making that Outlot 4 greenspace just south of the vertical element and pushing it towards the middle.

## **ACTION:**

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion provided for address of the above stated concerns and the following:

- The developer shall have the neighborhood meeting before the Plan Commission.
- The next time the developer comes back they show outlying context, the streets to the south, anything that would help us understand the connectivity better.
- Look at another method, of interconnectivity within the adjacent site.
- Regarding a possible hotel on Lot 7, coordinate more with the hotel on drop-off/pick-up issues.
- Modify the zoning text to incorporate the language regarding minimum and maximum story heights in feet and measurement from the lowest part on each lot.
- The Plan Commission review of the uses both permitted and conditional.
- The SIP reviews will require a continuing evaluation on all of the parking issues and circulation for the site as a whole.
- Look at stormwater placement and show why it's placed where it is; should not be hidden and isolated.
- Show accessible connectivity from the bus stops.

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, 6, 6, 6 and 7.

**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>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	5	-	-	-	-	5	6	6
	6	-	-	-	-	5	6	6
	6	6	-	-	-	5	5	5

General Comments:

- Marked improvement.
- Thanks for stepping up, it's much improved. Questions still remain but can see plan for accommodating development in phases.
- I would like to see more specificity regarding building heights for each lot.
- Improved, still questions about context and edge.