#### Urban Design Commission March 17, 2010 Submitted by John D. Martens

## EDGEWATER HOTEL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

#### Why this project should be voted down

The most significant aspect, and most relevant to your decision standards, the mass and volume of the building has increased.

- The building is closer to lakeshore.
- The building is taller.
- The volume has increased.
- The top floors on the lakeside have moved closer to the Lake

# New features in this version significantly increase the commercial impact in the residentially zoned neighborhood.

- The amount of parking has been significantly increased with a corresponding increase of traffic.
- The corner café has been given much greater prominence with a corresponding increase in public impact.
- Areas for non-room activities have increased.

### If the project is not voted down, why it should be deferred

The plan contains numerous unresolved issues

- There is no public agreement governing critical issues of public use of the plaza:
  - o Public seating locations and general usage priorities
  - Alcohol usage, especially at the café area
  - o Hours of operation
- The public restrooms are woefully inadequate.
- The path from the parking ramp to the public plaza extends through the hotel.
- The location of the surface entry and exit of the parking ramp is too close to Wisconsin Avenue, and no dimension is given of the critical side yard setback.

Key drawings are missing

- no sections or details of the planters and terraces
- no details of the new surface entry to the parking ramp
- no details of the original Edgewater rooftop tower demolition (see photo)
- no details of handrails and guardrails especially for the public area
- no indications of signage and lighting

There are too many inconsistencies in the submitted documentation

- Page A107 of the plan shows an unintended 4-foot floor projection at the lakeside of the building in which there are 10 doors that open to a 20-foot drop to the terrace!
- The landscaping in the plan does not match the landscaping in the elevations, and it is not shown at all in the perspectives.
- The "grand stairway" is different in the plans and in the elevations.
- Handrails and guardrails are sometimes shown in the plan, are mostly shown in the elevations but are too small to see clearly, are incomplete and deceptive in the perspectives, and are inconsistent among all of them.







