

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 4, 2009
TITLE: 666 Wisconsin Avenue - PUD(GDP-SIP) - Edgewater Hotel Expansion. 2nd Ald. Dist. (15511)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: November 4, 2009	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 4, 2009, 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 Sarah Carpenter, all representing Hammes; Susan Schmitz, representing DMI; Steve Bretlow, representing Building and Construction Trades Council of South Central Wisconsin; Michael Stark, representing MATC; Scott Watson, representing Carpenter Local 314; Jim Leonhart, representing the Aaron J. Meyer Foundation; Nicholas Tomkins, Alex Hitch, Rosemary Lee, Craig Argall, James Tye, Patrick Corcoran, Mark Landgraf, Mark Huber, Ross Faulkner, Julia Hausmann, Ken Axe, Steve Keld, Zach Zimmerman, Scott Faulkner, Judy Alberts, Maria Milsted, Derek A. Rahn, Brice Puetz, Tom Bergamini, Charlene Stevenson, Bill Elkington, Tom Sather, Christopher Culver, Daniel L. Milsted and Jackie Mernah. Registered in opposition to the project were Gene Devitt, Fred Mohs, Joe Lusson, Aleen Tierney, John Sheean, Michael Bridgeman, Ledell Zellers, Paul Schoeneman, Peter Wolff, Pat Sheldon, Mary Holland, Donna W. Peterson, Monica Messina, Samantha Crownover, Bruce Crownover, Megan Christiansen, Gregory Hitch, Tom Givnish, Michelle Martin, Jamie McCorulle, Joe Bonardi, Eddi Ignaczak and John Martens. Registered neither in support nor opposition were Robbie Webber and Peter Ostlind.

A presentation by Dunn and Supple provided an updated overview of the project as currently proposed and noted revisions to the Edgewater Redevelopment Plan as follows:

- Reduced height of expansion tower by 3 stories/30-feet;
- Reduced penthouse structure, no encroachment on Capitol View Limit;
- Height is compatible to National Guardian Life building and Kennedy Manor;
- Removed top level of 1970's low-rise building;
- More than 20 feet of height (2 stories) and 380,000 cubic feet of volume has been removed from the previously proposed design;
- Plaza is terraced, vehicular traffic is removed from view corridor;
- Enhanced configuration and flexibility of public spaces;
- Significantly enhanced experience on Grand Stair to the waterfront;
- The 1940's building becomes a feature of the development;

- Total program of the building has been reduced by nearly 100,000 square feet;
- The new podium building is set back 35-feet from the shoreline;
- The hotel program has been reduced from 228 to 180-192 rooms;
- Added potential to include 8-10 high end residential units;
- Reduced program from 364 to 226 stalls;
- Architecture has been advanced to incorporate signature design elements.

A review included references to shade and light study as part of the PowerPoint presentation, and notation of the elimination of the bridge connector at the grand stair. Public testimony in support and opposition noted the following:

- The utilization of a three-dimensional model of the current version of the project emphasizing that:
 - The project ignores zoning and requirements for historic district.
 - A 50-foot height limit applies; where 160-foot average height is more than double.
 - Lakefront development ordinance which requires an average setback of the five adjacent projects on each side and necessary variances have not been addressed at this time.
 - No Landmark approval and doesn't fit district.
 - Buses and drop-off don't accommodate the need.
 - See serious precedent with project, will provide emphasis for others to ignore requirements such as the zoning's 15-foot setback.
 - Issue with columns in the Wisconsin Avenue right-of-way, which are restricted by the ordinance amendment of 1965 vacating the end of Wisconsin Avenue; need to remove building encroachment into the right-of-way.
 - Need to acknowledge that all new development within the Mansion Hill District has met the provisions of the R6H District.
- Parking is a significant issue in the area, where parking isn't sufficient as proposed. The magnitude of the project disturbs the aesthetic feel of the area. Precedent will be that these kinds of buildings are given more consideration by the City. Need to take time to look at the facts.
- Opposition to the representation that the Capitol Neighborhoods, Inc. opinion was representative of that of the neighborhood.
- Need to provide for predictability based on zoning and requirements of the historic district. Support for the restoration and sprucing up of the Edgewater Hotel, but need more details on what that entails. Request that the Commission's referral of action on the project to absorb changes, including Landmarks consideration.
- The hotel is not visible from within the district or from the Capitol where the building would not support views.
- Previous study of the earlier version and its discrepancies, along with discrepancies with the new version as noted within an attached and distributed memo to the Commission further detailed the following:
 - Distortion in the view from Wisconsin Avenue taken from 12-feet above grade exaggerates the viewshed.
 - The project misses sustainability issues, lacks detail on restoration and remodeling of the existing structures.
 - Need to ask for 3D renderings to deal with accuracy of the "hand drawn" submittal.
- DMI's Board of Directors approved the design details for the project at its meeting of September 17, 2009.
- The obstruction of the Langdon Street view of the lake with the project, its disturbance of the neighborhood is not good for the community.

- Request referral until after Landmarks has acted, which will inform the UDC on relevant issues. Issues with the PUD, Criteria for Approval in that the project is not consistent with the spirit and intent of this ordinance (zoning).
- No tower setback on Wisconsin Avenue and includes the balconies.
- The NGL building setback at 60-feet is due to relevant height and mass issues.
- Historic district was established to prevent buildings like NGL.
- Need to not exceed the 50-foot height limit of the Mansion Hill Historic District and the need to respect the 15-foot setback in the Wisconsin Avenue right-of-way.
- Very little time for review by anyone of this current version of the project, including the City of Madison the current plan revisions. The Capitol Neighborhood is planning to have sessions for broader input where the Capitol Neighborhoods, Inc. has not taken a formal stance, appears UDC action would be premature on a new evolution of this proposal.
- Lack of presentation drawings and/or perspectives from Wisconsin Avenue showing the whole building, as well as experience with projects before the UDC not having perspectives from all streets.

Following public testimony discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- Relevant to the protocol between the Landmarks and Urban Design Commissions, it is not required by Commission or ordinance except with PUDs where the Urban Design Commission's role is based on its recommendation to the Plan Commission and Common Council. Need to start work with review of the project.
- Staff questioned the applicant as to the applicant's continuance of the presentation based on a review of detailed plans as part of a "hard board" presentation. No hard board presentation had been anticipated with current consideration of the project by the applicant. Staff noted to the applicant and Commission the necessity to provide for "a hard board presentation" of the project's details as referenced within the application packet in order to provide for an appropriate level of a detailed design review of the project not easily accomplished in absence of the required materials.
- Access to lake improved, removal of top two stories of the 70's building where public space amenities moved in the right direction, the step down 100% better.
- Look at building design that is site responsive. Question what studies have been done with the building that responds to the site.
- Define public spaces on drawings, provide information on the DNR approval of the pier, including documentation.
- The FAR of the project does not appear to be calculated correctly as the building is perceived on the site.
- Surprising that no architect has been involved in the presentation where the new building does not respond to the existing site and not there yet.
- There needs to be an architectural dialog between the tower in response to the 40's tower for the plaza area to become a successful space. The tower needs to site itself in terms of site detail as well as fenestration, massing and concept in relationship to the 40's tower. The revised tower better responds in terms of massing to the overall context, but the primary architectural response should be to the 40's tower while still creating a statement of its own.
- Provide eye level perspectives from the lake level, Wisconsin Avenue and other sight lines including cross sections as previously requested.
- Produce "hard board" presentation material including site and elevational details to help sell and illustrate the project including providing details of the shadow studies.
- Thank producers of model, appreciate its value, may lead for appreciation that mass on site could work.
- Need to have dialogue with architect; need to have a dialogue with that person.
- Like the step down, it opens views of the lake.

- Great stride in right direction, like to be able to point at it as part of a hard board presentation.
- Like heart shape of the interior island consider incorporating a bow shape into the design.
- Need to crack issue with height of building.
- Answer how bus/trucks turn around in loading dock structure.
- Provide details on the width of the stair as well as specific design details.
- Like redesigned plaza but raised portion very narrow, make it feel longer.
- Question rooftop installations; clarify where will they go?
- Like terrace going down, but the plan appears more of a private space, not public.
- Detail the width of the stair.
- Need more information on other required approvals to go forward.
- Provide details on previously requested tree survey.
- No problem with height but Landmark's needs to accept height; then we can deal with it.

Feedback from Ald. Bridget Maniaci noted appreciation for Urban Design Commission input in light of Landmarks Commission's absence of a Preservation Planner to guide its consideration of the project. No institutional knowledge available; look for the Urban Design Commission to provide input on design aspects. Continued discussion by the Commission noted:

- Landmark's need to provide feedback on historic impacts.
- If ordinance requires a 50-foot height limit, if not approved or provided then what; if waterfront setback and variance are not approved or provided for, then what? UDC needs to know the effect on the design as proposed.
- Setback from street may be appropriate, reducing height impacts good but need to know how important to Landmarks.
- A joint meeting would be helpful with staff to make clear on what layers of approval are involved. Need viewshed information from applicant.
- Concern with precedent from Landmarks point of view. Want to understand how precedent works and will it lead to slow march of development.
- Ask Traffic Engineering to provide information on the traffic analysis necessary to give initial approval. Provide tree survey as previously requested and include in plan including details, plans and elevations, etc. as part of a hard copy presentation in order to facilitate review of the project.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this project with instructions to staff to set up a meeting with the Landmarks Commission with a staff presentation relevant to the specific approvals required for the project, including standards for consideration and scheduling. Further consideration of the project by the Urban Design Commission requires a presentation of information relevant to traffic impacts by the Traffic Engineer, including a hard copy presentation of all materials including detailed plans and elevations, viewshed information from Gilman Street, Wisconsin Avenue, Langdon Street including both lake and Capitol views, along with details of the stair and perspective renderings as well as a request for computer modeling of the project as proposed. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0-1) with Luskin abstaining and Woods and Ferm non-voting.

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, 6, 6, 6 and 7.

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	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	Mass: 5	6	-	-	6	6	6
	6	6	-	-	-	6	7	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6

General Comments:

- Great improvements to 1970s building and plaza. Further develop architectural massing and fenestration and relationship to dynamic, fluid concept of 1940s. Success and justification of tower is through connection to the plaza and existing buildings.
- Lots of improvements, still a ways to go.
- Nice improvements – not convinced it fits historic neighborhood plan.
- Why is the architect not here? Building neighborhood better. Public space improved. Why is the building plan not crafted to suit the site plan? Lack of setback from Wisconsin Avenue still a great concern.
- We need more time for review! Still missing perspective views! Need presentation by the architect!