

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | |
|--|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | PRESENTED: September 22, 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: September 22, 2010 | ID NUMBER: |

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, Melissa Huggins, Jay Handy.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 22, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 666 Wisconsin Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Amy Supple and David Manfredi, both representing Hammes Co.; Ken Saiki, representing Ken Saiki Design; Mark Huber, representing BT Squared, Inc.; Ingrid McMasters, representing KJWW Engineering Consultants; and Stu Zadra. Appearing in opposition were Fred Mohs, Eugene Devitt and Pat Sheldon. Manfredi presented minor plan changes including an array of details for the project. On the Langdon Street elevation the public access has been pushed out to activate the edge and make a connection to the street. More meeting space has been added to lower level four to reduce the amount of mechanical area, and windows have been added to the north side. The two most significant exterior things done are reducing the canopy on the corner of Langdon and the canopy that was over the front door, in response to comments that they were too intrusive in the public corridor. Stone will be used on the first and second floors, the second to sixth floor is brick, with metal upward. On the 40’s building, part of the public pathway will be demolished and there will be rebuilding done to repair damaged materials. Saiki then detailed the site plan with a concept of descending staircases toward the lake. The vast majority of the site plan is what was shown at their last presentation. McMasters then presented lighting details, which was completed only after studying light levels in the neighborhood, settling on levels that are either at or below surrounding light levels. The pedestrian poles and wall mounted luminaires on the building are the only visible sources of light; all others are hidden. The system is equipped to dim depending on the activity in the plaza.

Fred Mohs spoke in opposition to the project, stating the lighting plans do not coincide with the presentation. He feels a heavily lit building is highly inappropriate in an historic district. They don’t expect it to be darker than the rest of the neighborhood, but on par with other lighting levels. He stated they are still dramatically short of parking. There are currently 723 parking places along Wisconsin Avenue going down Langdon in one direction and toward the lake in the other direction. There are 975 parking permits issued for those zones, meaning they already have an overabundance of parking. Their plans show a shortage of 503 parking places; 383 parking spaces during nights and weekends.

Eugene Devitt spoke in opposition, stating his concerns with lighting levels and excessive signage. His is concerned with flood lights going up the building. He mentioned the Fuller building next door, whose living room windows would be directly affected from these potential floodlights. He reiterated how important this is to the neighborhood.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Please explain how these buildings relate to each other.
 - These buildings now talk to each other in a kind of fundamental and organizational way.
 - Please go over the lighting plan in detail.
 - We do not have any uplighting at all on the face of the building. We have decorative sconces. We do have uplighting behind where the façade steps back. The fixtures are set back towards the face of the building and are a lower wattage. They are not dark sky compliant.
- On a number of our larger buildings we have asked for dark sky compliant.
- Could you walk us through the lighting in the stairwell and be part of the public access lighting.
 - Pedestrian poles are in one area, with step lights on the ground that continue down towards the lake. Pedestrian crossings have sconces for facial recognition. There is lighting underneath the canopies to light the sidewalk so you know where you are going. The step lights continue along the lakeshore, with mushroom fixtures (18” high) along the walking path with step lights along the egress stairs.
 - Do you consider this lighting to be proper in a historic context?
 - Yes, the goal was to have one footcandle or less along the site and that’s what we’ve accomplished.
 - Please explain the lighting on the north/east façade of the building.
 - There are egress lights on the stairs that are 24” above the steps, full cut-off on the loading dock doors. We wanted to give the building a presence and some volume.
 - Is there a way to think about shutting these lights down at some time every day? Is this a part of the overall plan?
 - Each one of these types of light fixtures has its own set of lighting controls. Each section of the plaza have the ability to be controlled separately with multiple levels of light in each zone. The plaza is intended to be 24 hours so to make it dark would make it unsafe and foster incorrect behavior.
 - We spent a lot of time reviewing how the lighting would affect the other buildings and what would be safe. All of these get shut down as the evening progresses and the building gets progressively darker. It’s important to remember there are people sleeping here.
 - How did you reach determination of what percentage the lights become darker?
 - It was questioned of staff whether it is within our purview to regulate when the lights go off; staff noted that the UDC approves lighting as a component of the project, which can be regulated under the PUD zoning.
 - I appreciate your concern about the night view. I’d be more comfortable reviewing and approving anything with that information.
 - Still want to see full sized view of entries in elevation.
 - Please explain the thinking behind the one piece of the terrace that’s jutting out. It’s completely off center and not even on the same grid.
 - It’s to give the feel of being “at the edge of the earth.”
 - Need to make it bigger to mesh with window patterning on the façade below the 70’s building.
 - Who is the signage on the top for?
 - It’s to reinforce the entrance to the building and the tower element.

I think the sign on the top is redundant. Everybody knows it is what it is.

- The massing is very richly detailed. I look forward to hearing what Landmarks has to say about the blending of old and new. The only part I'm curious about is where they meet.
 - That's been the source of a lot of study. This is very much about a streamlined aesthetic. At certain points the exuberance kind of spills out of the building.
- Did you study the radius reintroducing itself on the same radius? The balconies holding the rectilinear form?
 - We did draw that once and it wasn't quite as refined and it also pushes the building out towards the lake or reduces the usable square footage of the building.
- I'm unsure what that corner is trying to do and question hourglass melds with brick at the curve on the lakeside elevation.
 - It's melding the two vocabularies together, brick and glass wall.

Clear detailing needs to be provided.

- Use precast around elevator overrun but consider metal panel elsewhere to make lighter.
- The lightness of the top of the building...the precast brought a heaviness back to the top that I think you've worked so hard to eliminate, I don't know if precast everywhere is the answer.
- Very richly detailed.
- Have you been meeting with the neighborhood steering committee to show them the latest version?
 - No we haven't as of late. After the approvals were put in there was a letter submitted by the steering committee and they requested as a compromise that the canopies of the building be removed, and we did that.
- I have concern for your tree selection. I wouldn't use Virginia Creeper under those trees, it's just going to be a headache. You might look at different material that isn't so high maintenance.
- How much bike parking is there?
 - What we have is both bike parking on the surface and then in the garage. Surface we have 22 stalls and we're sharing the space in front of the garage with mopeds, so in a sense that's a sliding scale. There are 14 moped spots and 22 bike spots right there. If we found that the balance shifted we could slide the scale back and forth.

Concern is that bikers won't see the area down by the garage and will tie their bikes anywhere they can. It would be great to figure out how to put more bike parking in that area.

- Could someone please speak to the parking issues? It's been brought up and I'd like to hear your response to that.
 - Parking is a major concern for us as well as the neighborhood. There are 356 stalls planned in the garage. The ordinance for hotels is a 1 to 1 ratio; not one hotel in Madison has that. This is well in excess of the ordinance. The Zoning Administrator looked at the issue of parking and felt that the parking met the code and was sufficient to address the demand that is created here. It's a lot of parking and it's very situated and organized to manage the flow of traffic anticipated here. I think that has been addressed, studied, looked at by staff; staff has felt that it's adequate.
- Will you have valet parking here?
 - Yes. And during very busy times we would have valet parking and we can substantially increase the amount of stalls through valet parking. On-site I believe we can get almost 500 stalls.
- Twenty-two bike stalls seems like a pretty small number given that the plaza is intended for various purposes. I wonder if the bike parking number ought to be referred to the Bike/Ped Commission.
 - Staff indicated that the Zoning Administrator, as well as the Common Council has already reviewed and approved the parking counts. We could recommend that they increase the parking but we cannot dictate.
- Some of these lights that are washing the building; I'm wondering if some of those couldn't just shut off at night. I'm wondering why those need to be on at all after 11:00 p.m.

- Because it's a hotel it's a 24-hour operation. There are times at night when you'd want those levels to go down. Essentially the building is an invitation to the neighborhood and that doesn't stop at a certain time of day.
- I understand that, that adjustable lights at the entries need to stay on, but as far as washing the tower elements of the building, that seems kind of ridiculous to me to be lighting that after 11:00. I'm not sure who that's benefitting versus just adding more light. I would like to see that language changed within the chart on Page E6.00, "Exterior Lighting Control Intent" relative to the tower elements.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with O'Kroley, Barnett, Slayton, Huggins, Handy and Harrington voting yes; and Rummel and Smith voting no. The motion provided for the following:

- Resolution of the scale of the overhang of the scallop platform as noted.
- Need to include a caution regarding bike parking overflow available beyond stalls at grade.
- Resolution of the corner at the intersection of the masonry piece and the glass piece on the tower on the lakeside elevation.
- Study of the penthouse to reinforce the anchoring entrance/elevator over-run piece (precast) with a different material on the remainder of the penthouse.
- The lighting and photometric plan, including fixture cutsheets and narrative "Exterior Lighting Control Intent" on Page E6.00 of the plan set shall be reviewed to be "night sky compliant" and satisfy the provisions of Section 10.085 Madison General Ordinances as determined by Fred Rehbein of Building Inspection Plan Review. If there are compliancy issues these elements shall return for further consideration to the Urban Design Commission with a copy of Fred Rehbein's report. The Urban Design Commission will maintain continuing jurisdiction over the implementation of the lighting plan in order to ensure compliancy with its elements, including the management provisions contained on Page E6.00 of the plan set.
- Do not use Virginia creeper because of maintenance issues and look at Carpinus alterative.
- No sign at the top. All signs shall be in the same script.

Rummel noted that the public access piece and the front door are something we never really saw a rendering of. I need to make it more realistic. I think we've asked for stuff that we've never got. We've never looked at the front door of this thing. I'm not comfortable with not providing a full elevation of the front entry and not voting in support.

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 5, 6, 6, 7 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 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7 |
| | 6 | 5 | 6 | - | - | 6 | 5 | 5 |
| | 6 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 6 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 7 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Too tall!
- Still missing detail.
- Nice refinement to waterside façade of tower.
- Continue to develop detailing to reinforce massing concept, movement and dialog with existing site.