

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> August 17, 2011
TITLE: 5115 University Avenue – PUD(GDP-SIP) for a Mixed-Use Development in UDD No. 6. 19 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (23464)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: August 17, 2011	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of August 17, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 5115 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Ken Saiki, representing Ken Saiki Design; Eric Lawson, representing Krupp Construction; Aaron Johnson, representing Potter Lawson Architects; Paul Lenhart, and Ald. Mark Clear. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Dan Day, representing the property owner. Registered and speaking in opposition were Bill Fitzpatrick, Jackie Csedo, representing the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association; Addi Faerber, Jeff Turner, representing Midas Auto Service; Richard J. Pearson, and Michael Kienitz. Registered neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak were Greg Hull, representing the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association; Amy Kinast, Herman Felstehousen, and Noel Radomski, representing the Glen Oak Hills Neighborhood Association. Lawson noted changes to the plans that include Phase II being wrapped with residential around the parking garage. He provided details on Phase I of the UW Digestive Health building along University Avenue, a new entrance off of University Avenue, a detention area, a 25-foot setback along University Avenue, and multiple sidewalks for a pedestrian-friendly environment with views from Old Sauk Road presented. He stated that the results of a traffic study were still pending and detailed several areas shown for possible pocket parks. Saiki presented the planting plan at the GDP level to include street tree planting, plantings in parking areas on grade, natural plantings along the bike path and some detailed planting for some of the areas around buildings. The Digestive Health building will be approximately 60,000 square feet with below ground parking. Building materials include brown brick with iron spot, simulated dress-faced stone and metal with champagne anodized look. They are looking at using the LEED certification for health care and would be the first for the City to do so. Dan Day addressed the traffic study that will be available for distribution within two weeks. Stormwater run-off is a major concern for both the neighborhood and the development team; they have done a significant amount of management on this site through the bioretention facility on the far west of the site and lowered the impervious paving to 71%. They are looking at integrating some of the taller prairie grass where appropriate. They have hired someone to monitor the environmental impacts during construction and to deal with the state and federal regulations.

Amy Kinast spoke about the history of the neighborhood and her previous visits to the Commission. Her nomination for 5117 University Avenue will move forward to the Plan Commission on September 19, 2011.

Michael Keinitz spoke about the amount of stormwater run-off and what that means for the area. He was told that the well in this area is very susceptible to contaminants applied at the land surface and at the stormwater run-off. A community environmental specialist also commented that this development has been static for many years; site demolition and construction could produce new contaminants from the surface which could enter the water supply.

Herman Felstehousen read a prepared statement representing the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association Development Review Committee. They ask for a referral in the context of the well conditions and the unique character of the area where development would take place. While the board supports development of the Erdman parcel, the proposal currently presented lacks adequate detail and in some cases fails to address critical problems in regards to stormwater runoff, wellhead protection and traffic impacts (where the traffic studies have yet to be completed).

Noel Radomski spoke as the President of the Glen Oak Hills Neighborhood Association, which is also abutting the development parcel. The neighborhood is also in favor of infill development and are in full agreement with Spring Harbor to refer this development at this time. They also agree they do not have enough information to make an informed decision. The traffic modeling analysis is not yet completed, issues related to environmental concerns and wellhead protection have yet to be determined.

Richard Pearson spoke in support of development on this parcel, but again reiterated the need for more information.

Jeff Turner spoke as the owner of Midas next door and lives in the Indian Hills neighborhood. He has attended every private and public meeting on this project in both iterations. He pointed out that the neighborhood has been waiting for a traffic study for over a year and a half. As a business owner he can appreciate the 5,000 customers this project will bring to the area, however, the closer you look at it the worse it gets. They have talked but they have not listened.

Addi Faerber spoke as a resident of the Trillium Neighborhood. She opposes the development because it is grossly out of scale with the neighborhood. The proposed buildings will dwarf the small single-family homes in her neighborhood. The 3-story parking deck would be 26 yards from her back door. It will increase the isolation of her community; the developers will cut down mature hard wood trees just over the property line exposing her house to the noise, light and dust of construction for possibly the next ten years. The proposed buildings turn their back to the neighborhood and are effectively building a 3-4 story wall around the east side of the neighborhood. There are no proposed bicycle, pedestrian or vehicle connections between the neighborhood and the proposed development. This development could derail the improvement of this fragile neighborhood.

Jackie Csedo spoke as a member of multiple neighborhood groups. She stands behind all the other comments made and asked the Commission to refer this project. She finds issue with the density and maintaining property values in the City. The neighborhood is surrounded by mostly one-story buildings. She reviewed the goals of the Urban Design Commission, specifically assuring a functionally efficient city in the future; she does not see infrastructure in this development that is going to make this anything near efficient.

Bill Fitzpatrick spoke about the PUD standards and the need for time to address these standards. He reiterated that most of the issues brought up tonight are the same issues that were brought up during the Erdman proposal for this property. Overall he sees much to like about the project, but specifics have not been addressed.

Ald. Clear spoke in agreement with Spring Harbor and Glen Oaks Neighborhoods. He feels confident that issues with stormwater and wellhead protection can be resolved over the next month or so before this project goes to the Plan Commission. He is still concerned with the lack of traffic study. He supports a lot of the developer's green initiatives and hopes green roofs will contribute to the infiltration problem, perhaps even pursuing a TIF grant to make this possible. He agrees there needs to be a connection to the Trillium Neighborhood and stated that the developer has been working to accomplish this. He disagrees with the neighborhood on the hotel height; he sees 6-stories as acceptable for this site as it will not affect the sight lines from University Avenue or Old Sauk Road. He doesn't see that the site would loom over the existing residential homes. He hopes to see this project continue to move forward.

Tim Parks of the Planning Division stated that the traffic study has been going back and forth between the developer and Traffic Engineering because of the key issue of the intersection of north/south public street at University Avenue and the need for that intersection to be signalized. Currently Traffic Engineering has asked the developer to provide the data model for how this project will impact University Avenue and Whitney Way in terms of trip generation, as well as preliminary designs as to how University Avenue would look to review the design in terms of the need for additional right-of-way and geometrics based on three design scenarios. Wagner pointed out that according to the timeline given by Parks, the Urban Design Commission and the neighborhoods would not be able to look at this before acting on design issues. Rummel pointed out that the UDC does have jurisdiction over the stormwater management plans and inquired about wellhead protection zoning. Parks replied that typically stormwater issues are handled by City Engineering, and they are in the process of reviewing the preliminary plans for this project. Water Utility is also actively involved in many aspects of the project. Infiltration is not permitted by State Statute in wellhead protection zones, so the developer is proposing a bioretention pond to filter some of the contamination out of the water that flows to it. Huggins asked if there was anything that the traffic study could come up with that would alter the design of the PUD from a design standpoint.

Greg Hull spoke as the president of the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association. He stated that as a design committee, if we agree that this is a unique site that requires unique run-off, he sees that as part of design.

Huggins stated that she does not see pedestrian connections have been added and feels that is important. She recalled from the Erdman Holdings proposal that the neighborhood was in opposition to any connections. She suggested the neighborhood make that happen and get the appropriate rights-of-way put in place. The developer stated they have put an invitation to the Trillium Neighborhood to have a connection put in; they have not heard from the neighborhood yet.

Smith found that the SIP is way ahead of the GDP, in particular stormwater and traffic. The UDC needs the storm and traffic handled at that level. Slayton stated that the developer is proposing what is more pervious on the site than what it is right now. The applicant stated they are not infiltrating on the site because of the wellhead protection and the fact that they cannot infiltrate anything other than open grass areas. Slayton responded that there is still run-off with a grassy area. Rummel asked if they had a sense of what is in the underground tanks. Day stated that Erdman Holdings apparently dealt with some of that in their work on the site; you have to have mechanisms in place to deal with what you find. Day noted that the Erdman report was reviewed by the DNR and they accepted the findings. O'Kroley asked about the viability for the 2-story building handling some rainwater. They stated they would use a tank and use the water in the building. Regarding landscape and the existing trees, she asked for clarification as to how many trees along the westerly property line will be cut down. He responded that they have made a commitment to the neighborhood to maintain the path going through there and that if there is a tree on a property line it will remain. They will try to maintain as much greenery in that area as possible. Where trees are taken down they can be supplemented with an evergreen tree to bring the screening back. Harrington brought up issue with the front of the building on

University Avenue; it looks like very strong foundation plantings but he would like to see more trees. He also suggested hanging greens to help with the landscape plan. Wagner stated that this is the first citizen commission to see things while the City is still developing material that is not at their table; citizens come here and expect the UDC to have answers to their concerns and the City is not set up to make that happen. Parks stated that the applicant has presented plans that comply with Chapter 37; he doesn't know that more information is going to come back to the commission based on what Chapter 37 requires unless they ask for more.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by O'Kroley, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion provided for the following:

- Coordination with Traffic Engineering relative to the traffic impacts that may affect the site development plan based on the completion the traffic modeling analysis.
- Coordination of proposed on-site stormwater management with the City Engineer to determine adequacy of on-site stormwater management facilities.
- The Urban Design Commission's encourages the use of green roofs with all SIPs within the development when applicants return for SIP approval.
- Study of the landscaping at University Avenue to incorporate large scale trees and foundation plantings including coordination with Marla Eddy, City Forester on the location of trees in the City's right-of-way.
- Utilize grasses along University Avenue to improve and incorporate hanging vines or green surface on the west face of the parking ramp.
- Study the density of the greenspace between the neighborhood and the parking ramp as a priority.
- Provide that the GDP landscape plan more closely meshes with the Conceptual Plan.
- Continue to study the pedestrian connections to the west as well as the south.
- Provide an east/west cross-section of the site looking north and going through the proposed massing for both parking structures on the west.
- Look at expanded on-site detention.

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, 7 and 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 5115 University Avenue**

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

General Comments:

- Traffic and stormwater need to be handled and documented in a clear and strong way.
- Need stormwater and traffic plan.
- Underground storage tanks or roof holding capacity for slowing stormwater detention?
- Create effective green buffer along west. Explore green roof viability. Address Trillium construction concerns.