

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 15, 2006
TITLE: 702 North Midvale Boulevard – Hilldale Redevelopment – PUD(SIP), Humana Site, Mixed-Use. 11 th Ald. Dist. (04090)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: November 15, 2006	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 15, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(SIP) for the redevelopment of Hilldale, the Humana site located at 702 North Midvale Boulevard. Appearing on behalf of the project were Domenic Lanni, Joseph Lee, Mike Sturm and Steve Holzhauer. Appearing in opposition to the project was Laura Moberly. In response to the Commission’s previous review of the project, the modified plans featured the following as noted:

- Raised crosswalks and bulbing out of curbs along Frey Street and Sawyer Terrace at pedestrian crossings and intersections.
- An effort to work with Traffic Engineering on providing for a “T” intersection with the configuration of Mall Drive at University Avenue.
- The opening of the wall area along University Avenue adjacent to Building “M” to provide for five stairway accesses (two previous) with an all brick masonry wall featuring vertical relief utilizing plantings in combination with lighting fixtures.
- Additional bike access provided to the upper plaza off of Frey Street and off a ramp entrance off of Mall Drive, in addition to a proposed elevator.
- The Whole Foods north elevation now features the utilization of all vision glass.
- The north façade and west façade of the parking garage has been further detailed in elevation with additional landscaping and screening plantings provided.
- A commitment that Buildings “Q” and “P” are maintained as a components of the plan.
- Details of the hotel as an element of the overall master plan as required by previous request from the Common Council was further detailed, as well as future residential development as part of the amended PUD-GDP. Both the hotel and future residential development were noted as placeholders, requiring future consideration with a PUD-SIP.

Moberly spoke on concerns as previously noted at other hearings on this project relevant to traffic impacts, in combination with the future hotel; she requested its removal from consideration of the project. Staff noted to the Commission that the hotel is part of a requirement for a master plan on those lands yet to be developed established with the prior consideration of an earlier version of the project was a required component of the

project that requires a recommendation by the Urban Design Commission to both the Plan Commission and Common Council. Following discussion on the project between the Commission and developers, the applicant agreed to provide for solar collectors instead of rooftop screens on Building “Q.” There was some concern with the design of the pergola as lacking and needed more...too sculptural, too transparent, requiring more plantings, furnishings, etc. The applicant agreed to follow-through on this issue with additional detailing to be provided for staff review and approval.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Ald. Radomski, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0-1) with Woods abstaining. The motion required address of the provision of solar collectors instead of rooftop screens on Building “Q,” as well as additional detailing on fenestration and furnishings, including landscaping, in conjunction with the design of the pergolas on the rooftop deck.

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, 7, 7, 7, 7 and 8.

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	6	7	7	6	-	6	7	7
	5	8	7	7	-	7	7	7
	6	8	7	8	-	7	9	8
	7	7	7	6	-	7	8	7
	6	7	7	7	6	6	7	7
	7	7	-	-	-	-	7.5	7

General Comments:

- Thanks for all the improvements and hard work.
- Nice! This is city building! Despite the scale, there are several ped-friendly elements that make it right. One major negative is the high-speed “Y”-shaped entry off of University Avenue.
- Nice job.
- A long haul. Quite an evolution.
- Like the green roof, good landscape plan and pedestrian development.
- Finally, really quite a well-designed, complex and well-developed design.