

## AGENDA # 10

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

|  |  |
|--|--|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION   | PRESENTED: May 7, 2008                     |
| TITLE: 4021 Grand Crossing Road - Amended PUD(GDP-SIP) for Retail, Large Retail, office and Movie Theater. 17th Ald. Dist. (10258) | REFERRED:<br>REREFERRED:<br>REPORTED BACK: |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary  | ADOPTED: POF:                              |
| DATED: May 7, 2008   | ID NUMBER:                                 |

---

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Marsha Rummel, Bruce Woods, John Harrington, Richard Wagner, Richard Slayton, Jay Ferm and Bonnie Cosgrove.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 7, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on an Amended PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 4021 Grand Crossing Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Christopher Thiel, representing SAA, Katie Falvey, representing Marcus Theatres Corp., and Tim Anderson. Anderson began by providing an overview on the previous master plan for the site established with the development of “The Crossing” approved as part of an overall PUD-GDP in September of 2003. Anderson emphasized the details of the plan, which established the development of a main street provided for the development of retail, professional offices, a hotel combined with residential development to the east, as well as its residential development over proposed ground floor retail. Thiel summarized the development concepts contained within the proposed amendment to the overall PUD-GDP that provide for the development of a 96,365 square foot theater complex for 16 theaters, a large lobby area, a bowling alley, as well as restaurant and food service, as well as outdoor dining. Thiel emphasized that the revised plan still provides for the integration of a “main street corridor,” parking levels consistent with that as previously proposed in number, and will provide for more information on stormwater management issues with further development of the concept. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Remember the planning process behind the original plan; a good plan. The new plan is not the same, no focus, features a huge parking lot, no relationships between buildings, poor pedestrian accessibility. The new project is a departure from the concepts within the original plan.
- The main building puts its back to the greenspace and provides for a sea of parking.
- The diagonal stalls at the entry to the north of the intersection of Grand Crossing and Crossing Place are in reverse orientation.
- The level of surface parking doesn’t relate to the locations of buildings and lacks the gracefulness of original plan.
- The previous version solved problems with its plan such as the location of pervious parking as it relates to open space, as well as the concept for providing a main street. The modified proposal has no thoughtfulness, look for something of a similar standard.
- Previous concept was groundbreaking; new version is not.
- Turning back on greenspace is not smart.

- Provide more of what original plan proposed.
- Can't see main entrance to the main building (Marcus Theatre) from the proposed main street; at best corner of the building.
- The modified proposal, a total non-starter.
- The big picture of this design is not of a high standard.

**ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION**, no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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 1, 1, 2, 2, 2 and 4.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 4021 Grand Crossing Road**

|                       | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>Member Ratings</b> | 4         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | 4                                   | 4             | 4              |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | -             | 1              |
|                       | 1         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | 2                                   | 2             | 2              |
|                       | 2         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | 2             | 2              |
|                       | 2         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | 3             | 2              |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | -             | 1              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |

General Comments:

- Hierarchy of roadways needed. Site lines/focal points will help. Better plan organization.
- It’s an interesting project but it would be far better if the site plan were more responsive to the surroundings. It can work, but needs some substantial reworking.
- Very bad concept with way too much open parking lot.
- Surprisingly and distressingly poor conceptual design. No other way to say it, unfortunately.
- Uninspired development driven by parking lot. Look back to original GDP for solutions. Not supportable in current form. If rated, would give a 2 – “critically bad” because 2001 GDP raised expectations.