

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | PRESENTED: November 4, 2009 |
| TITLE: 702 North Midvale Boulevard (Target) - PUD(GDP-SIP). 11th Ald. Dist. (16448) | REFERRED: |
| | REREFERRED: |
| | REPORTED BACK: |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary | ADOPTED: POF: |
| DATED: November 4, 2009 | ID NUMBER: |

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 4, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 702 North Midvale Boulevard. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jaci Bell, Roxanne Nelson and Tom Carrico, all representing Target Corporation; Mike Sturm, representing Ken Saiki Design; Scott Watson, representing Carpenter Local 314; and Tom Givnish. The plans as presented provide for the development of a two-level Target store featuring the upper single level sales floor including offices, stock area and food services overlying a 470 stall lower level parking deck (partial surface) exposure on its westerly end, combined with future development of a hotel site on a portion of the property abutting Segoe Road and University Avenue, including a parking ramp structure to serve the hotel as part of an overall revised PUD-GDP for this portion of the Hilldale redevelopment with a first phase SIP to facilitate the immediate phasing of the Target facility. Following presentation of the plans the Commission noted the following:

- Need to address the standards for “Large Detail Developments” and Urban Design District No. 6.
- Look at providing dedicated pedestrian routes between parking stalls to connect to the primary entrance to the upper level store.
- Look at clearstory windows on the Frye Street elevation.
- Provide more details on an open box culvert feature in the surface parking area to that accommodates stormwater.
- Bring pictures and presentations on other similar Target operations.
- Provide windows on University Avenue and elevations adjacent to the interior mall and backside operations.
- Question building entry, mall is a small pedestrian campus, Target is not tied in with the rest of the mall. Not convinced that entry is in the best place; need to relate to circulation pattern of the rest of the mall. Look at the easterly façade as an alternative entry location.
- Entry as planned a good visual corner but not necessarily functional.
- Provide information on traffic demand due to store as well as a detailed stormwater management plan.
- Look at daylighting stair towers as an additional option.

- The Frye Street side of development looks like the backside of the shop; need more architectural interest.
- Look at making underground parking more interesting.
- Provide information on overall traffic circulation.
- Study and provide details on the interface with adjacent condominium building with the concept plan for that portion of the site's redevelopment.
- Like entry as planned but need a design that encourages people to walk; push entry further to the south along the easterly façade along Hilldale Way toward the main drive aisle with Sentry. Look at options to providing a green roof as was proposed with the "Whole Foods" project.
- Look at introducing a small element at the ground level along Hilldale Way at the ground plane to obscure vision into the lower level parking ramp.
- Look at safety as a key to allow people to come and go; not the ratio of stalls.
- Look more favorably at being less than at one stall to 300 square feet of retail space.
- On parking, Sentry parking inadequate where encouraging Target to cut back on parking not accommodating to visitors.

Givnish spoke neither in support nor opposition, noting the following:

- Concern with traffic circulation blocking University Avenue.
- Concern with the lack of parking for Sentry.
- Infiltration area good idea but too small and difficult to infiltrate.
- One level of development not good use of space, should be two levels minimally.

Continued discussion by the Commission noted the following:

- Previous experience with the site supports the belief that the entry should be central to the east elevation and visible from University Avenue. Consider east bound traffic view-ability handled by a sign or tower off of the northwest or northeast corner of the building. The corner feature design on University not realistic or safe, will lead to back-up on University Avenue, want to encourage people to walk into store and return into the mall, want to relate to Hilldale as a neighborhood, make as many pedestrian connections as possible, building a good use of high quality design and materials, provide windows on University Avenue in order to resolve transparency issues.
- Want to see blow up of surface/truck circulation area as well as interface with Hilldale Way. Look at covering more of the currently exposed rear surface parking in favor of exposing more surface parking along the eastern elevation, need parking off the southeast corner.
- Look at the approach coming from Segoe and capacity issues.
- Look at incorporating a green roof.
- Make the roof pleasing per the requirements for Urban Design District No. 7 requiring daylighting.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal 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 4, 5, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 702 North Midvale Boulevard

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Member Ratings | 4 | 5 | - | - | - | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| | 5 | 6 | - | - | - | 4 | 6 | 5 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Integrate architecture with the site to solve challenges.
- Impact of large retail on this urban retail campus poses many challenges – parking, circulation and connectivity.
- Need to minimize big box appearance. This is not pedestrian friendly!
- Full entry on axis with aisle from Sentry.
- Pedestrian safety and ease is the priority. Bike and vehicular circulation is the challenge. Look at adjusting footprint to fully cover parking and create open space at southeast corner and develop park/greenspace.
- Move entry to east façade! No parking entry on east façade?