

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** January 25, 2006

TITLE: 700 University Avenue – Amended
PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development
– 8th Ald. Dist. **REFERRED:**
REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: January 25, 2006 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Ald. Noel Radomski, Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Lisa Geer, Robert March, Michael Barrett, and Jack Williams.

Members Excused: Bruce Woods and Cathleen Feland.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 25, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of an Amended PUD(GDP-SIP) for a mixed-use development located at 700 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Mark Bastian, Eric Lawson, Gary Brown, Michael Duhr, Greg Rice, Adam Smith, Rosemary Lee, and Jim Surentny. Prior to the presentation, Wagner and Ald. Radomski noted their abstention from consideration of the project. Lawson informed the Commission that only initial approval was being requested at this time with additional details as to exterior lighting, exterior building façade materials and signage anticipated to accompany a request for final approval in late February. The revised plans as presented featured the following:

- The east campus mall area features a colonnade of canopy trees, combined with seating areas featuring cast stone pavers with built-in seating as part of planter seat walls and entry portals to accommodate outdoor eating restaurant use.
- A variety of perspective renderings and elevational details were presented, in conjunction with an overview of the previously approved mass studies provided with the overall GDP. A more detailed review of the retail, University of Wisconsin offices and student facilities, as well as residential components was provided, including details of the proposed rooftop gardens which include shade structures and plantings within a tray system.

Following the presentation the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- Concern with too much shade off the north side of the building on the rooftop. Provide shadow studies on this space relative to survivability of plants and adjust proposed plantings appropriately.
- Attempt to do one area of lawn in a greater open space area on the rooftop; to prevent students from damaging the tray system and to facilitate more activity.

- Additional concerns were expressed with the grid/tray system, which does not take into consideration people actively moving or utilizing the areas.
- Clarify the application of brick and precast over all proposed elevations.
- As details evolve interested in jointing for precast panels; provide greater attention to windows, entrances and signage.
- The “U” graphics need further clarification and study.
- The overall landscaping approach for the East Campus Mall area is friendly/diverse intimate space.
- Like the overall direction of the project such as the canopy element along the mall, consider making it wider to accommodate two-way pedestrian traffic.
- Look at providing more entryway articulation.
- Look at grounding each corner of the lower retail level with a major entryway.
- Like distribution of bike parking around site.
- Look at options for tree plantings to be not in raised beds to accommodate more stormwater.
- Look at providing movable furniture in mall seating areas.
- Relative to the return on windows; the distance between the plane of the wall and mullion system shall consider deeper recesses.
- Problem with Lake Street and University Avenue elevations with residential block; although rhythmic, lack character when compared with other elevational details, looks flat and where it meets the sky is underdone.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barrett, seconded by March, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of an Amended PUD(GDP-SIP) for a mixed-use development located at 700 University Avenue. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0-2). Voting in approval was Host-Jablonski, Barnett, Geer, March, Barrett, and Williams, with Wagner and Ald. Radomski abstaining. The motion required address of the above, along with more details relevant to site lighting, signage and building materials.

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, 8, 8, 8, and 9.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 700 University Avenue

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Member Ratings | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | - | 7 | 6 | 6 |
| | | | | | | | | Abstain |
| | 8 | 7 | 7 | 6 | - | 7 | 8 | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | Abstain |
| | - | 5 | - | - | - | - | 7 | 6 |
| | 8 | 7 | 8 | - | 6 | 7 | 9 | 8 |
| | 8 | 9 | 8 | 9 | - | 7 | 10 | 9 |
| | 8 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Coming along nicely! Each corner should be grounded with prominent entrances with large triangular plazas. There must be significant entryway features all along the sidewalks, a la North Michigan Avenue in Chicago. Canopy is a nice feature which should be wide enough to be functional as weather protection.
- Facades on University Avenue and Lake Street are inferior to the other facades. They're too flat with no cornice and with under-developed corner elements. Retail facades lack scale and detail.
- Trespassing onto the roof tray system could be a major problem. The open area between the two patios may be too attractive as an open space not to look into providing a lawn area like the shade trellis solution for limiting access and adding shade as well as vertical interest. Overall project is very positive!
- A superb multi-function design with superior aesthetics.
- Careful attention to use of precast, its detailing and joint pattern.