

AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: July 12, 2006
TITLE: 2313-2525 East Washington Avenue, Phase I, Mixed-Use Development/2306- 2422 Winnebago Street/11 South 5 th Street – PUD(SIP), Union Corners. 6 th Ald. Dist. (04010)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: July 12, 2006	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 12, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for Phase I of a mixed-use development located at 2313-2525 East Washington Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Lance McGrath, Bruce Simonson, Paul Cuta and John Lichtenheld. Prior to the presentation, it was noted by staff that the overall PUD(GDP) for the Union Corners development (approved by the Commission on December 21, 2005) contained significant conditions of approval that were required to be addressed with consideration of the first phase SIP for this development. Staff further noted that address of these prior conditions would be provided by the applicant with any further consideration of the first phase SIP requesting any level of approval. Under this pretext, staff felt it was appropriate for the Commission to receive an informational presentation on the first phase SIP for Union Corners with the understanding that required address of previously established conditions would be provided upon further consideration of the project. The plans as presented provide for the development of Buildings C, G and the reconstructed French Battery building as part of the phase one SIP. Paul Cuta, architect provided details of the development of the G series of buildings, consisting of three separate residential condominium buildings set over a shared below grade parking structure and joined at the main level with a raised semi-private community terrace. The building complex reflects a simplification of architectural style, "Industrial," all of which are four-stories in height. Two of the three buildings have frontage abutting the newly located Winnebago Street that feature stoops and entries to the street. The Building G complex is located off of the southerly perimeter of the site adjacent to the railroad right-of-way and adjoining residential development. Following the presentation on the G building plans, the Commission noted the following:

- Issue with dumpster location next to residential.
- Meet cross-section through building grouping in contrast with adjoining neighborhood development.

The Building C elevational details were then presented by architect Bruce Simonson on a site located to the northwest of the G grouping on the northerly side of the relocated Winnebago Street. The C building (also an industrial style) is four-stories in height and provides for mixed-use over one level of underground parking. The underground parking level contains 67 stalls and the ground floor will include a residential lobby, community

space and 16,500 square feet of retail/office or live/work space. The other three floors will be residential condominiums consisting of 63 living units. The exterior façade treatment subdivides the building into a series of four-story vertical components that will be distinguished by varying brick color, bookended with a glass curtain wall system on the end elevation of the building and interconnected at its center with a curvilinear roof element. Following the presentation on Building C, the Commission noted the following:

- Like the articulation but don't like the curved element.
- The glass end treatment is bothersome, doesn't go with the industrial theme; needs to be more hardy with a glass impression of an industrial style building.
- Provide considerations for a penthouse and green roof treatment.
- Although the overall project for the first phase SIP is being presented to the Commission on an informational basis, there is a problem that it has not been presented to the neighborhood association. Review by the Commission contravenes neighborhood development protocol.

Following the presentation on Building C, Lance McGrath updated the Commission on the redevelopment issues for the reconstructed French Battery building. McGrath noted that the overall plan had been modified from its previous approved location under the PUD-GDP at Sixth Street and Winnebago Street to a site off of Fifth and Winnebago Streets. An overview of three different development options were presented, providing for the reconstruction of the building in its current configuration, its reconstruction with an 80-foot long, three-story matching addition that completes the entire block face, with the remaining option featuring a complementary but architecturally different three-story addition. McGrath also noted that the previously approved sales office (formerly a furniture outlet on East Washington Avenue) required some adjustments to its site to provide for additional parking at the rear of the building. Following the presentation on these items, the Commission preferred Option B and that there needs to be a look at all proposed buildings as a whole on the site with some consistency in detailing and illustration provided.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION**, no 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 7.5 and 9.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2313-2525 East Washington Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	9	7	-	8	-	8	9	7.5
	-	-	-	6.5	-	-	-	-
	9	9	-	-	-	9	10	9.5

General Comments:

- Both buildings are on the right track.
- Architecturally heading in the right direction; industrially influenced. We need to see the details.
- Why did this come to UDC before the neighborhood got to see it?
- The option B addition to the French Battery has merit especially with underground parking. Building G-consider only a 3' change from grade to finish floor, still provides a separation but less formidable at grade level. Building C-central elements need more development.
- Industrial theme appropriate.