

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: April 21, 2010
TITLE: 5117 University Avenue – PUD(GDP), Erdman Center Project. 19 th Ald. Dist. (18094)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: April 21, 2010	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Todd Barnett, Acting Chair; Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Ron Luskin and Richard Wagner.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 21, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(GDP) located at 5117 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jon Snowden, Jane Grabowski-Miller, Frank Miller, and Bill Suick, all representing Erdman Holdings; and Janet Loew, representing the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association. The project provides for the development of a number of properties under the Erdman ownership adjacent to University Avenue to the north and Whitney Way to the east. The redevelopment of the combined sites are under a proposed PUD-GDP for a mixed-use development for business offices, medical clinics, convenience retail and complementary uses such as hotels, restaurants and related residential. The Erdman development team provided details on the development plan. All of the combined properties are proposed to be developed outside of the existing PSC building and an on-site utility structure. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Provide more context on existing situation, structures and adjacent land uses.
- Question how much stormwater can be retained on site so as not to affect the Spring Harbor area and provide additional information to address traffic issues.
- The development of surface parking abutting the property’s University Avenue frontage is troublesome, need to pull buildings to the street. In addition, deal with the potential for a commuter rail station. In response, the architect noted that its consultants emphasized the need to provide parking at the street in order to support retail. The Commission still maintained its position that some extent of building should be provided to relate to the site’s University Avenue frontage beyond the extensive surface parking as proposed.
- Todd Barnett, Acting Chair provided an overview of comments submitted by Jay Ferm, alternate Commission member relevant to his concerns relevant to parking, traffic, pedestrian and bicycle circulation in association with the redevelopment proposal.
- Surface parking should be reduced along University Avenue, it needs to be more integrated.
- Concern with phasing plan which emphasizes building surface parking, creates a sea of concrete.
- Need Traffic Engineering and City Engineering to talk about future improvements on University Avenue and other adjacent areas as to its effect on development within the University Avenue corridor/Urban Design District No. 6.

- Concern with the demolition of the existing structured parking to create more surface parking. The applicant noted limitations with the existing structure that provides for no continuous access to each of its levels as well as being an obstacle to future phased development.
- Work with maintaining and providing for on-site infiltration to minimize impacts on adjacent neighborhoods and lake.
- Concept great but parking on street an issue.
- Align parking with building face to create more greenspace at the street.
- Provide a terminus at the single line of the internal street with the new “L” shaped building.
- Use building “A” to screen parking lot.
- Combine greenspaces to create more of a public area.
- The spaghetti of routes off of Whitney Way needs to be resolved. Rethink drop-off access to the hotel.

Janet Loew, president of the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association, Zoning Liaison spoke noting excitement and lauding the Erdman project, but concerned about stormwater run-off and traffic. Concern with Traffic Engineering statement that there would be no problem with the project, especially without projecting and identifying uses and without study. Loew noted the need to encourage a University Avenue corridor study as well as the need to provide adequate greenspace, not just open space with the project. She further noted the need to establish maximum heights for building development. She further noted the lack of notification on meetings held relevant to the project to the Spring Harbor Neighborhood. Further discussion by the Commission noted the following:

- Thanks for sketch and schematic drawings but need existing site plan with north arrow and scale and dimensions on all plans.
- Terminate more of a public space on the private streets.
- Address relationship of adjoining with parking ramp, transitions and connections and look at structured parking in lieu of development and extent of surface parking, especially structured parking below buildings to help eliminate the need for large parking fields and structures. Look at turning building to an “L” shape to diminish parking at the street along University Avenue.
- Disappointed that architectural direction is traditional, not modern or contemporary.

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 6, 6, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 5117 University Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	-	-	-	-	6	7	6
	5	-	-	-	-	5	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	7

General Comments:

- Refinement of parking and circulation is critical. Open space links (within) will benefit project. Stormwater filtration and storage design needs innovative techniques.
- Stormwater management should try to infiltrate as much on site or save/storage for reuse – study retention of existing parking structure. Look at traffic impacts and University Avenue reconstruction opportunity – University Avenue corridor plain would help plan for future development and City should pursue. Underground parking?
- Traffic/parking needs resolution. Interesting ideas!