

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: September 20, 2006
TITLE: 2340, 2416, 2504 and 2507 Winnebago Street (Union Corners) – PUD-SIP, Five Buildings with 140 Condominium Units and 63 Rental Units and Commercial/Retail, Urban Design District No. 5. 6 th Ald. Dist. (04486)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: September 20, 2006	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 20, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-SIP located at 2340, 2416, 2504 and 2507 Winnebago Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Andrew Hanson, Dan Melton, John Lichtenheld, Lance McGrath, Todd McGrath, Paul Cuta, Marc Schellpfeffer, Bruce Simonson, Colin Godding and Christopher Thiel. Prior to the presentation on this item, staff noted that address of the previous conditions established with the approval of the overall PUD(GDP) for Union Corners (December 21, 2005) would be provided by the applicant with the formal consideration of this first phase SIP. The building plans for this phase of the PUD consists of the development of Building A and B, a 2.4 acre portion of the site at the corner of Milwaukee Street and East Washington Avenue, in addition to Building C, Building G group (three associated structures overlying lower level parking and shared open space amenities), the relocated French Battery Building and addition and the renovated sales office. Cuta provided details on the development of Building A, a mixed-use retail office building with grocer and Building B, a commercial/retail building. Details of Building C, a 4-story mixed-use building overlying one level of the lower grade parking were presented by Bruce Simonson with details of the Group G buildings presented by Cuta. Details of the relocated and reconstructed French battery building were provided by architect Godding, in combination with a proposed addition featuring a similar architectural style in a contrasting complementary brick. Thiel provided an overview of the site/landscape plan emphasizing collective and separate amenities associated with each of the proposed buildings under development. Thiel also elaborated on innovations relevant to stormwater management and infiltration proposed with the project with John Lichtenheld spoke on sustainability green features, recycling, pedestrian/bicycle amenities and features, as well as traffic. Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Concerns were raised regarding Building A (as referenced in a memo from Host-Jablonski) relevant to issues with its glass façade inappropriate for the corner, how it addresses the street and functional location of outdoor space.
- Like the green features, including stormwater provisions and other amenities but want to make sure that they are confirmed with approval of this phase of the PUD-SIP.

- Relevant to Building C the architecture is fine but the building is very long; creates a very long block. Want to see a through passageway to connect through with bikeway extension across the relocated Winnebago Street right-of-way.
- Need more unifying elements throughout with other buildings and provide some tie-back to the adjacent neighborhood.
- Need some relationship between the treatment of the Milwaukee Street and East Washington Avenue and treatment of parking lot; the building is pushing people away but not inviting people in from both the pedestrians' and drivers' perspective.
- Relative to French Battery Building, concern with the diminished value of original building with new addition eliminating symmetry of original building. Consider two-story addition with complementary original architecture. Consider creating symmetry by adding bookend additions to the original French battery building.
- Consideration of Building A should be weighed and balanced with development of future Phase 2 architecture and building development; should look at the transition from old to new architecture already portrayed with the first phase of development in juxtaposition with existing development along the East Washington Avenue corridor. In addition, building development and future Phase 2 should relate to other buildings along East Washington Avenue in terms of styling, additional detailing and differentiation on a lot level should be considered, including more windows, punched openings, etc.
- The appropriateness of the design of the water tower element should be reexamined; too cutesy.
- Wing on top of Building C is out of place.
- Consider incorporating complementary elements into Building A.
- Relevant to the Building G group; needs pedestrian-bicycle access off its easterly apex.
- Concern with soft turning radii on internal streets permitting faster car movements.
- Consider reducing the pavement with the roundabout.
- Need to provide pedestrian refuge within the roundabout area and its northerly extension.
- Provide more covered bike parking, for example, integrate into overhang areas.
- Consider incorporating large awnings on all buildings to provide sun and rain protection and to bring scale of large buildings down abutting walkways.
- The collective buildings have no continuity; need something to weave them all together, should be diverse but doesn't complement itself, common features are too subtle.
- Like Building A but doesn't relate to remainder of the overall site. Building doesn't connect or hold together.
- Building C-still don't like curve element, doesn't relate or connect with other buildings. Consider putting a galleria or pass-through in Building C.
- Site development looks innovative with the use of green and water retention facilities.
- Planning for Building A is OK, but still appears as an "object out there."
- Building A appears to be cold, looks civic, looks museum-like building but not reading as a retail commercial space, investigating.
- The big mass of Building A is an issue. Pull some brick in from other buildings. The signage component may help the building including landscaping. Signage should be down low to complement pedestrian level.
- The curve feature on Building C needs to be eliminated, along with areas of all brick with no openings reexamined to let in light. The balconies are too open, need more integration to the building. The little bit of EIFS is too small, eliminate. The eyebrows on the building should have mass and not look tacked on; needs more study.
- Consider providing more reference to the architecture of the French battery building as a unifying element with other buildings.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Geer, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1) with Barrett voting no. The motion required that the applicant look at details relevant to the French Battery Building and addition, Buildings A and C contained in the comments within this report, along with review of building materials and colors with consideration of final approval. In addition, the applicant was requested to reexamine Building A as it relates to the corner relevant to pedestrian orientation of the entry and landscape treatment. The proposed water tower element was also requested to be reexamined with a design alternative provided.

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, 7, 8 and 9.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2340, 2416, 2504 and 2507 Winnebago Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	A-5 B-5 C-6 G-6 Rayovac-7	9	6	6	6	6	6
	7	7	7	7	-	6	7	7
	8	A-8 B-7 C-6 G-7	8	-	-	7	8	8
	10	A-7 B-7 C-6 G-8 FB-7	9	9	8	9	10	-
	8	6	7	7	-	6	6	7
	9	8	10	10	-	8	10	9.5

General Comments:

- All of the green elements (stormwater management, solar, green roof, wind power, cistern, etc.) must be firmly committed to (i.e., not watered down over time). “A” building turns its back on the street – despite transparency – in the way that Overture does at Henry and State. “B” building needs better ped connectivity to “A”. “C” needs a ped gallery (weather enclosed OK) in the middle to connect neighborhood to Main Street. “G” buildings are probably over uniform. There needs to be a ped/bike connector at the southeast corner to the back of the parking lot. Winnebago Street is too wide and is designed to be a high speed cut-through. The roundabout is still too big; the eastern leg does not provide ped refuge. Throughout, the corner curb radii are designed for speed, i.e. very anti-ped. Back-in diagonal parking would be safer for cyclists and more convenient for car drivers (who otherwise would be blocked by SUVs). Generally, there are scale issues that need to be dealt with to make this a more humane site; variation in height within each large building, providing porticos or giant awnings over some stretches of sidewalk would help scale down these buildings. The water tank will be a nice whimsical touch. Wind turbines at this location will have to be very high. The infiltration strategies proposed should be the model for the entire City.
- Superb planning, land use, green features. A-bit cold, reads more like corporate, civic, museum building; components don’t read/express themselves on street; brick colors; signage will help B-fine, but similar

comments. Curve does not seem resolved and not integrated with architecture; linkage to roof? Static but could be a good background building. Balconies look uncomfortable. G-very well done. French-fine although one could quibble about brick colors/detailing between new and old. Needs more community garden spots.

- Would like to see more unifying architectural elements throughout development including Building “A” reflecting back possibly on the French battery building. The building entry and landscape at corner of East Washington and Milwaukee Street needs to be more inviting to the pedestrians. The landscape composition and open space is very inviting, how to get there is not always easy from outside of the development, from bike path from Farwell and Anzinger, across from East Washington Avenue mid-block. Sustainable elements make the project very unique and important.
- Masonry areas of Building “A” need some adornment.