

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: May 11, 2011
TITLE: 1001 University Avenue – PUD(SIP), St. Francis Episcopal Student Center Redevelopment – Relocation of the St. Francis House and Construction of a Twelve-Story, 90-Unit Residential Building. 8 th Ald. Dist. (21945)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: May 11, 2011	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 11, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(SIP) for St. Francis Episcopal Student Center Redevelopment located at 1001 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were J. Randy Bruce, and Att. Bill White, representing LZ Ventures/John Leja; Ken Saiki, representing Ken Saiki Design; and John Leja. Appearing in opposition to the project were Sue Gaard, John Robison, Brian Ohm, Al Larson, Gary Brown and Harvey Temkin, all members of or representing Luther Memorial Church; Rev. Brad Pohlman, Eric Alborn. Appearing neither in support nor opposition as Gary Brown, representing the UW-Madison. Bruce talked about the project creating an opening and view line into Luther Memorial’s religious enclave. He noted that stories 5-12 frame Luther Memorial and enhances the setting for the church. The St. Francis house will be shifted west and moving closer to University Avenue, with the setback essentially matching Luther Memorial’s setback at 25-feet. An updated site plan shows a curved façade that relates to the St. Francis House and Luther Memorial. He addressed the concerns of acoustics with students on balconies; the closets balconies that are pointing towards Luther Memorial are approximately 135-150-feet away. Vehicular circulation comes in off Brooks Street with Conklin Place used as for a loading zone and bicycle/moped parking. Building materials would include stone or precast skin on the heavier solid surfaces, complemented dramatically with a glass and metal skin used elsewhere, creating vertical pieces accented by glass elements. Sunlight studies have been done for the impacts on Luther Memorial; the shape of this project was influenced by the results of those studies.

Att. Harvey Temkin spoke representing Luther Memorial. He stated that Luther Memorial is not against any future development in the area, but they are concerned for their property and the impacts nearby development would have. They have engaged their own lighting study to evaluate lost light, and engaged an engineering firm to study the potential future structure will impact their structure as well as concern with traffic. He requested the Commission refer this matter until Luther Memorial has had an opportunity to receive and review these studies. This project should be done with collaboration with the neighbors and no negative impact on the church.

Rev. Brad Pohlman discussed the parking related issue on Conklin Place. While they are happy the parking has been moved they are still concerned with mopeds and the drop-off for the nursery school, without this building proposal Conklin Place is already a mess.

Al Larson spoke as the president of the congregation. He added that Luther Memorial is a unique building in the city and it can't be appreciated without going inside. He invited any member of the Commission or public to visit the church, particularly in the mornings when the light is good.

Brian Ohm discussed the historical nature of the buildings, the architecture firm that was involved with their creation and how the new structures are very much out of context for the entire block in terms of history, height and setbacks. It was asked if the St. Francis development could not move forward, what kind of building would Luther Memorial like to see in that location? He responded that the site is the perfect location for campus ministry.

Gary Brown shared the views of the University as Facilities Manager. They have concerns regarding a shadow study on Grainger Hall, traffic movements on Brooks Street and the moped/pedestrian impacts on Conklin and Brooks.

John Leja spoke as a representative of LZ Ventures. This parcel is zoned R6, which is the most intensive residential multi-family zoning that Madison has. This is not part of the campus master plan or the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan. They feel they are consistent given this zoning and have tried to modify the site and structure to address the concerns of Luther Memorial.

Wagner reminded the Commission of Amy Scanlon's Landmarks Commission report on the project.

Barnett asked what would be allowed under the current zoning regulations. Staff noted that less density and height with yard and setback requirements would affect the project. Rummel asked about how both churches are eligible for Landmarks status. A memo dated May 9, 2011 from Amy Scanlon, Preservation Planner noted that both are eligible for local landmark designation. Bruce replied that it would be a trade-off. If they were to put St. Francis House back on the corner and the housing component next to Luther Memorial, the impacts on Luther Memorial would be significant. Keeping the massing and housing away from Luther Memorial and out of the solar axis line, that was most important. O'Kroley wondered about more density on Conklin and less density on University. She inquired about a proposed use for the relocated house. Bruce responded that the chapel would be restored and could be available for their use; the remaining house would be available for their use and would be renovated. She found it odd that the form of the building is making so many gestures to create this lower mass of built form on University and there is all this effort towards relocating the structure when there is an allocation of resources to scoot something out of the way to build something bigger, when in reality she felt that leaving the house where it is and let time tell what happens with the University side of the site. Bruce said they looked at doing almost all of the structure on Conklin Place but the solar effects on Luther Memorial were too great. Barnett inquired as to who would own the property if this is built and would there be subdivided parcels? Bruce said two parcels would be created through a CSM, creating one lot for the St. Francis House, with the remaining L-shaped lot being privately owned and operated. Barnett wondered if the cost of the project was causing the building to become too large for the site. Wagner mentioned the importance of having these ministries on campus; keeping them in some fashion is a significant gain for our collective desire as a city; that we have to recognize that there is something else there other than just the design. Barnett followed up on the comment of moving St. Francis House; he asked Luther Memorial which was more important: the view from University or the light? The Reverend was not prepared to answer that question. Barnett is intrigued by O'Kroley's idea of moving the St. Francis House. Rummel agreed; not only is the campus ministry important but the setting of that block as well, it's almost like a green oasis on that busy corridor. She further

acknowledged that the applicants have tried to address all of these issues, but felt that St. Francis should have some representation at the meeting too, along with the congregants from Luther Memorial. She wants them to study other ways of doing this. Smith had a strong feeling that there needs to be more meetings between all the players on the block and the applicant. He doesn't feel they are at the point where they can discuss the architecture in a meaningful way. He feels that meeting needs to happen. Slayton questioned how important the balconies are given what students usually store on their balconies. Ald. Scott Resnick replied that what has been brought to the Commission comes after a tremendous amount of study and did not come lightly. Rummel inquired about Brooks Street being the main entry; the applicant responded that the current iteration really makes more sense. Smith asked about more eye-level perspectives. Barnett suggested that when the applicant comes back they bring all drawings to show the Commission why certain things do not work, including O'Kroley's suggestions for moving the building, options for locating St. Francis in other areas (Brooks Street) as well as a simple massing study. Smith said even if it is a simple model, maybe they could "put us on the sidewalk" around the block to get a sense of how grand central works with Mills Street. It would be helpful to get a sense from the street. Smith reiterated that he would like the "players" involved in the meeting process, so that when the applicant comes back they can tell the Commission they met with all the pertinent players, including the Ald. Scott Resnick so the Commission has some reassurance that the usual steps that go through a neighborhood committee, of which there isn't one here, those have been taken. Scott said he met with the developer early in the process and asked them to meet with Associated Students of Madison (ASM) for their feedback. From a neighborhood perspective, Resnick noted that the president of ASM has received positive feedback on the project. He stated that the developer has gone through the process that he requested to meet his level of satisfaction in meeting with the community.

ACTION:

On a motion by Smith, seconded by Lufler, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0). The motion for referral noted the above stated concerns.

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 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1001 University Avenue

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

General Comments:

- Resolve impacts on neighbors and historic St. Francis House. Appreciate efforts to address sun but need more comfort on impacts.
- Work in progress.