

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: January 20, 2010
TITLE: 666 Wisconsin Avenue – PUD(GDP-SIP) — Edgewater Hotel Expansion. 2 nd Ald. Dist. (15511)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: January 20, 2010	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 20, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 666 Wisconsin Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were David Manfredi, architect, Ken Saiki, representing Ken Saiki Design; Robert Dunn, representing Hammes Company and Amy Supple, representing Hammes Company. Registered in opposition were Stephanie Stender, Fae Dremock, John Sheean, Michelle Martin, James McFadden, Pat Sheldon, Gene Devitt, Paul Schoeneman, Fred Mohs, Robert Klebba, John Martens, Ledell Zellers and Peter Ostlind. Registered neither in support or opposition were Erica Fox Gehrig, Susan Rosa, representing Downtown Community Gardens Group and Mary Pulliam. Registered in support but not wishing to speak was Luke Porath.

The informational presentation began with public comment as follows:

- Mary Pulliam questioned the use of questioned the use of white color stone and materials with the suggestion for the use of a greater color palate, along with suggestions for the use of bay windows to allow more view into the rooms, as well as, providing ADA alternatives to the grand stair.
- Peter Ostlind spoke noting the project was severely underparked, below code compliant levels where there are no nearby ramps to offset and provide for parking overflow. Relevant to the loading dock, it doesn't meet the Zoning Code requirement for 3 loading berths. Bike parking on the site and in-ramp not clearly dealt with. The verbiage relevant to public space, its location and use, is not clear.
- Ledell Zellers noted that options and alternatives were not provided as previously requested by UDC. The project is the same as previously proposed and has issues with meeting the PUD standards, as well as conformance with the Zoning Code provisions relevant to the height of the proposed tower, as well as issues with the historic district and the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan. She further noted that comparisons with comparable buildings within the area, the building as proposed is bigger.
- John Martens spoke noting the following: building is too big, connection to lake is too weak, the so-called "public space" is too private. No changes to building as proposed since last UDC meeting. The scale of the project is an important issue, not addressed. Currently the area which is part of the Wisconsin Avenue right-of-way is public, but public space as proposed has the feel of private space that allows for some public access. Question how much of a connection to the lake is provided, weak,

pathway as proposed is weak. Rail not shown on far end of the terrace. Needs more greenery. Needs to more like a park. Needs to have more public activities and use. Details need to be loosened up and user friendly to get public feel. Connection to lake (stairs) needs to be wider.

- Robert Klebba spoke noting issues with the upper plaza driveway as an obstacle to get to the lake as the proposed ideals outside of the ice rink are private space ideals. Stair: no real ADA access. Access to the hotel is private where stairs too narrow, not a public space.
- Fred Mohs spoke noting issues with the volume and physical siting of the tower and setback. The setback along Wisconsin Avenue is a minimum of 10-15 feet with the NGL building setback at 60 feet. The hotel is down to 0 setback, is going backwards and will constrict the view. Building needs to be moved over.
- Paul Schoeneman noted the need to widen stair with elimination of rooms and parking if necessary and provide practical wheelchair access and the following:
 - Half of upper plaza devoted to vehicle access and traffic; question the loss of public space.
 - Need more details on design of public space.
 - Question impact of less parking provided on historical district and the immediate area.
 - Question the feasibility of the use of valet parking to offset the lack of available onsite parking.
- Gene Devitt spoke noting the proposed location of the grand stair adjacent to existing residence as an impediment to those residential properties, placing and enhancing a non-residential use. He further questioned what's next on the vacant properties adjacent to the expansion site for the hotel if the project goes through.
- James McFadden spoke noting: a normal PUD should include the remainder of the property, all the NGL lands and the following:
 - The renderings provide incomplete info, don't show complete picture of plaza plus the whole building.
 - The mass of the building omitted from presentation materials.
 - Need a setback to maintain views of the lake.
- Erica Fox Gehrig spoke on issues relevant to gross volume of the new tower as visually incompatible, bigger than buildings around. She further noted that proportions of the building don't mesh with adjacent existing development and further noted conflicts with horizontality of the verticality of the new tower.

The following public testimony, questions by the Commission were as follows:

- Questions the loss of lawn to hard space, problem with extent of proposed hardscape, green pad more public, hardscape more private.
- Questioned the need to address stormwater provisions associated with the development.
- Questioned DNR approvals, not sure if pier should be there without an agreement – look at ways to open stair.
- Questioned the use of space by the potential public.
- Questioned guidelines for use of public areas; need to be provided. Need to be sure that space is designed to accommodate public access and function and want to be sure what constitutes it.
- Questioned if the primary view from Wisconsin Avenue is a driveway, a private function.
- Provide an alternative access to the lake as an option to the stair.
- Need to provide perspectives from all around the building, still need to see. Want to see all four building perspectives and all full building elevations.
- The previous plan held project together more by providing a green.
- Need to address issues associated with lakefront setback issue and necessary variances.

- The design of the façades in grand stair needs to enliven currently blank walls of parking structure needs to be animated.
- Question how if in a wheelchair, how to get to the waterfront from Wisconsin Avenue/Langdon Street, detail.
- Question treatment at lakefront, walkway, boardwalk and details need to be provided.
- On the 1970s side of the stair, had program, now none.
- Detail how much pier can be built without DNR approval and further the 40s buildings.
- Question: why not build over garage to push building out of the setback.
- Access to public space needs to be defined.
- Question the load capacity target, for the structural load of the plazas, as it effects capacity established by the Fire Department, make sure it doesn't limit its use level. Provide information before final consideration.
- Like project but still concerned with massing, if new tower based on topography doesn't fit; could lose a few stories.
- On the old Edgewater, revised Rigadoon room design, not sure if design is there, looks suburban, where the original drawings portray a softer curve. The architecture of the Beaux Arts Wedding Cake building doesn't relate to the 40s building.
- Concerned about the setback from the existing right-of-way and placement at sidewalk, need to preserve view corridor.
- Consider changing floorplans for units to stretch out building to increase view corridor.
- Building should step up so higher faces Capitol with lower facing the lake.
- Concerned about East façade of loading dock, needs to be looked at; question punched openings.
- Want to be moved and awed by building, agree to not mimic 1940s building but should reflect it, needs a really bold move, should be a building that's built for today, look at stair, the project is 90% there.
- Do more research on the 40's building architecture, clarify the intent of the window treatment.
- Question why building doesn't setback on eastside.
- Need to speak to the concept of urban street wall, tower street wall, and a 1940s street wall. Question the need to be symmetric on a vertical access with the 40s building. Uncomfortable with the height of the building and its rigidity.
- Overall design of architecture doesn't respond to the overall environment, not yet a timeless/beautiful building with more whimsy, play with asymmetry.
- Need to provide views of the project from the water to the Capitol, look at garage view, not there yet.
- Building seems heavy, not inviting or engaging or well-crafted, building not as active as is crafted with space between. Building needs to be designed as a building that's built today, needs to have more transparent architecture on the water, needs more color, the suggestion for the removal of 3-stories with the top remaining as is, as 2, raises issues with the tower's proportions.
- Beautiful space, lots of period reference are misleading, details lessen the conclusion; base treatment doesn't have to be at the base at lake, could be linear as with the 40s building. The overall architecture should look at creating a 3-part composition.
- Need more details on the Langdon/Wisconsin Avenue elevation.
- Consider playing up the central element to lighten up the streetside elevation.
- Look at the proportions of solids and voids, top is much too light, the setback between top and below; not enough, need changes in plan to provide relief. Question if top of building has enough relief.
- Pull glass piece all the way down to the water on the lakeside elevation and simplify details on the upper floor balconies and refine floor lines.
- The top needs to be a bigger stroke.
- Look at the progression from 40's to the NGL building; should feel like a newer design.

- Need balance between grand civic concept and plaza scale.
- Primary view from Wisconsin Avenue is a driveway. Question if it can be removed and question taking public right-of-way and turning over to private use.
- Consider eliminating the Victorian shape with the greenspace rounded by the access drive to be more streamlined, designed to enhance mid greenspace and moved from edges.
- Find a way of reducing and removing visual impacts of drive with a change in geometry.
- Upon further consideration the project, do not provide any late pass-outs at the meeting because it prevents prior review by the Commission members and is not available to the public.
- Consider an alternative design to the oval-shaped active areas in the lower plaza, look at options.

ACTION:

The Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION.**

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, 7 and 6.

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	5				6	7	6
								info
								7
								info
	6	6	5	6		6	5	6
								info

General Comments:

- Consider continuation of the line of street trees through the plaza, open ended to frame the lake. The ‘oval’ plaza design somewhat narrows the view.
- Provide a plaza plan indicating realistic potential tree locations with respect to the parking garage structural system.
- Question the aggressive events programming for the plaza. Suggest more passive uses.
- The rectangular plaza option relates better to the lake (and the fabric of the city) and presents a more contemporary design. Stylistically: consider the Piazzetta at San Marco.
- Would like to see architectural options treating the plaza base architecture differently from the tower architecture. The present design evokes a stone castle upon a stone cliff; majestic and somber. Consider approaching the design of the tower as a sculpture and the plaza base as a pedestal (extending beneath the tower).
- Make it a 3-piece design: old 40’s, 70’s addition, new building needs a big stroke. It looks like it would fit on the square, but it’s on the water. It needs to work with the water.
- Need info on stormwater and DNR permitting of pier, etc.
- The plaza area should NOT be a highly programmable space. This will take space away from the “public” areas.

- A skating rink on the plaza seems like a waste, when you could have a much larger skating rink on the lake if they maintained the ice the way the City does at their skating facilities. With the skating on the lake, the view from the plaza and the Brigadoon room to the lake would be more interesting.
- Restore the grass panel and try to keep the plaza as green as possible.
- Reduce the height and mass of the new hotel building to respond better to the existing 1940's building.
- Step building section to take advantage of lake views. I want to be inspired by the architecture. Stair width seems adequate for existing conditions. Craft plan for site – make narrower to provide some minimal setback. DNR setback, pier – need answer. “Village Green” now seems too fragmented – prefer simple lawn approach.