

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** July 20, 2011

TITLE:      1102 South Park Street – PUD(GDP-SIP) for a Four-Story Commercial Building and Parking Structure in UDD No. 7. 13<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (22565)      **REFERRED:**  
**REREFERRED:**  
**REPORTED BACK:**

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

DATED: July 20, 2011      **ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Mark Smith, Henry Lufler, John Harrington, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Todd Barnett, and Ald. Marsha Rummel.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of July 20, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1102 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Chuck Ghidorzi, Allan Fish, representing the University of Wisconsin-Madison; Mike Felker, representing Strand Associates, Inc.; James Kurtzweil, Lindsey Lee, Andrew Kessenich, representing 1102 South Park Street, LLC. Appearing in support and available to answer questions were Nathan Wautier, representing Ghidorzi Companies; Neil Feldt, representing the University of Wisconsin-Madison; and Chris Ghidorzi. Chuck Ghidorzi touched on some of the recommendations contained in the Wingra BUILD Study and their desire for medical, office, hospitality and some retail uses. A community room is included to house 100 people. The building has been moved back about 12-feet for a sidewalk and some greenspace. There is an area for a bus terminal as well as a traffic study. The parking structure has been moved 14-feet off of Fish Hatchery Road with 6-feet dedicated back to a future roadway, and 9-feet back off of Midland for the potential purpose of a left-turn lane. Following a neighborhood meeting were requests for considerations for pedestrian crossings; some restriping with participate in pedestrian lighting. He discussed the importance of entrances and parking in certain positions for the medical aspects of the development. The possibility of townhouses does not work well on this sight or financially. They also looked into moving the parking structure but they feel the visibility of the parking structure from the windows is key. They have doubled their count in terms of plantings for the landscape plan. Ald. Sue Ellingson spoke about the importance of good design and what the neighborhood wants. The neighborhood wants a place that is walkable, welcoming to pedestrians and to the City. Staff and the Urban Design Commission have asked for something more pedestrian-friendly and she does not see that in any changes to these plans; at the very least an entry onto Park Street. The bottom line is that this neighborhood needs this project. Lindsey Lee distributed a handout and gave his general thoughts that this project, although not perfect, is important and as he sees it fits in with the Wingra BUILD Study. He would prefer an entrance on the street, but also sees that Park Street is very busy and noted that the new South Side Library does not have a door on the street. Kurtzweil spoke representing the ownership of the Bancroft Dairy site and was influenced by the Wingra BUILD Study. They have searched hard for the right developer to kick off this development. They were focused on just the Wingra Clinic and gave Ghidorzi credit for growing the project. Mark Felker, of Strang and Associates, spoke as someone who worked on the Wingra BUILD Plan, and he feels this project fits right in and be a very positive thing for the

neighborhood. Al Fish spoke about the University's involvement in this project and the importance of its outreach through the University. He urged focus on improving the design and function of the project without compromising the business plan and the imperatives that come from running a clinic, having a good functioning floor plan and having a good parking plan. He suggested focusing on getting an appropriate setback on Fish Hatchery Road so they can have urban street trees along the road that will help significantly deal with the setback and still have to have enough parking for the use while appeasing the neighborhood and City. He suggested looking at design alternatives for putting the entrance on the corner and having it engage with Park Street rather than having the entrance in the middle of the building directly on Park Street.

Barnett suggested looking at their remarks from the last meeting presentation to see where changes may have been made. The Secretary read those comments from the last two presentations. Barnett then asked what was different from the last time. Ghidorzi responded that they have shown what future development on Fish Hatchery Road could look like, which he feels allows you to look at future buildings. He stated they do not know how to respond to putting 600 cars on a triangle with two structures for a hotel and a medical campus. There are not a lot of choices at this location. They need the land in terms of being able to have a four-sided building with windows on all sides. Wagner stated they have five access points for one building. Rummel asked if they have looked into a green wall on the parking structure. Ghidorzi replied they had some fine characteristics they have looked at and can look at more. Barnett said the key for him was the front door on Park Street. He suggested putting the community room on the street and stretching out the entry to make a larger vestibule that becomes part of the community room. Coming down the street you would have no idea what this building is; by pulling out the canopy you would be able to see what is going on here. Harrington was still bothered by how he sees this plan treats Fish Hatchery Road as a dead zone with surface and structured parking. He looks at the aerial that creates a big dead zone along Fish Hatchery; no amount of trees will make it enjoyable to walk along an empty parking area at night. He is not comfortable after hearing UW Health say they want a surface lot for safety purposes. He further stated that any tenants should realize they are working within an urban area. Wagner suggested the possibility of staging parking to be sure they don't overestimate its necessary level and to link it to parking potential that will occur on the adjacent "Clark Street Development" property and to support the option for infill development with a future building pad. Slayton talked about the site circulation and number of access points. Smith agreed with Slayton that the Clark Street boundary could be very simply done and could benefit both properties. If the cut-through is really necessary then treat it as a street. He stated that the architecture doesn't match the floor plan; the floor plan is formal and yet the architecture is very asymmetrical and has a lot of movement to it, as well as changes in materials. It's contemporary and forward looking. There is no entry defined at all. If the "person" graphic was not included in the plan drawings you would have no idea where the entrance is. It's not activating the corner in a way the Commission would like to see. He suggested turning the signage 90 degrees to help with branding and visibility. Barnett followed up with a suggestion that pulling the parking off the ground and making the parking garage taller would work well by offsetting the need for the amount of surface parking. O'Kroley strongly encouraged elimination of the west access point as a vehicular drive. In terms of parking, the pedestrian walk on the upper level gained them a covered walk on the ground surface. If that can be a focus of pedestrian circulation as opposed to the back door it would work better. Having the entry at the back, as you approach the building with no paved surface to walk against, you are forced into the lot. As a person you are sort of forced to enter in a vehicle. Ghidorzi replied that there is 10-feet of sidewalk that runs all across the front. O'Kroley stated that the entry was still in the back. She suggested their canopy as a way to draw attention to the entry. Wagner suggested a potential for linking this parking with the use of the next parcel.

## **ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion provided for address of the above-stated concerns and the following:

- Try to eliminate the number of entry points off of Park Street and Fish Hatchery Road.
- Look at a relationship between this parcel and the Clark Street future development in order to share access points and parking.
- Look at reducing parking on the site if possible.
- Look at adding another level to the parking structure.
- Look at ways of putting an entry on Park Street.
- Look at the architectural suggestions made, including flipping the stone element perpendicular to the street.
- Adjust the pedestrian circulation, particularly as it relates to a future building pad along Fish Hatchery Road.
- Look at a green screen or some other technique on the parking structure along Fish Hatchery Road.
- Look at eliminating surface parking off of High Street.
- Bring in previous iterations of the site design and layout.
- Planning and Traffic Engineering staff reports shall be provided to address issues associated with the project especially consistency with the “Wingra Market Study and Conceptual Redevelopment Plan Summary Report” upon further consideration and which shall require further discussion of all issues with City staff.

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, 4, 5, 5 and 5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1102 South Park Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating	
<b>Member Ratings</b>	4	5	4	-	-	4	4	5	
	5	6	4.5	-	-	5	5-4	5	
	6	6	-	-	-	4	7	5	
	4	7	5	5	-	4	3	4	
	3	5	4	-	-	4	5	4	

General Comments:

- Way too suburban! Not offensive but where is the invention?
- Appreciate the positive give and take!
- Energize Fish Hatchery – consider identifying surface parking as lot for future development. Look at ways to green walls of parking structure. Review circulation/reduce at streets. Bring porte-cochere to Park Street and consider adding uses to activate corner, such as a community room.
- Progress on responding to the UDC comments is disappointing. Needs a front door. A real one.