

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: July 6, 2011
TITLE: 1102 South Park Street – PUD(GDP-SIP) for a Four-Story Commercial Building and Parking Structure in UDD No. 7. 13 th Ald. Dist. (22565)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: William A. Fruhling, Acting Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: July 6, 2011	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Mark Smith, Todd Barnett, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Melissa Huggins and Henry Lufler.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 6, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1102 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Chuck Ghidorzi. Appearing in support and available to answer questions were James M. Kurtzweil, Chris Ghidorzi, Nathan Wautier, representing Ghidorzi Companies; Michael Heifitz, representing Dean Clinic; Neil Feldt, representing University of Wisconsin-Madison; and Andrew Kessenich, representing 1102 South Park Street, LLC. Chuck Ghidorzi reviewed the site location and surrounding properties. The plans call for a four-story building with roughly 75,000 square feet, the first two floors of which will be for the Wingra Clinic, the fourth floor for the UW Medical Foundation use, and a third floor use has yet to be determined. A 2-story parking structure will contain 201 stalls. Two surface parking lots will provide 65 additional spaces. Kessenich reviewed the Wingra BUILD Plan, which calls for medical uses in this area and specifically cite the UW as a recommended participant in the redevelopment. Kurtzweil described a potential concept for the Clark Street Development piece immediately to the north that will be included as a GDP in this submittal. He noted these are to illustrate how the site could develop if the Ghidorzi site develops as proposed.

Barnett stated that this is going to set the benchmark for other redevelopment along Park Street and it needs to look more urban than suburban, with a front door on Park Street. He expressed concern about the surface parking lot on Fish Hatchery Road. Ghidorzi stated that a future building could be placed there if needed. Barnett suggested showing that as a future phase. Slayton stated there is an excessive amount of asphalt, too many access points, and nothing ties the building to anything green. Harrington encouraged them to consider how all of the site and parking lots are tied together with landscaping and noted that breaking up the concrete areas with trees is crucial. Huggins stated that this is not an adequately urban development for this site and it needs to be at least two-sided. Fish Hatchery Road needs to be activated with other uses and the parking needs to be rethought. She also strongly encouraged them to work with Clark Street Development and coordinate on the parking. Smith suggested using the east-west street between the parcels for access and sharing a parking structure. The developer stated they are uncomfortable with limiting entrances and exits onto Park Street and Fish Hatchery Road to that location due to the speed of those streets. Wagner reiterated the high number of access points off of public streets is problematic, and encouraged them to revisit that issue.

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 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
Member Ratings	5	6	5	-	-	5	5	-
	4	5	4	-	-	5	4	5
	5	5	-	-	-	4	4	5

General Comments:

- Must have a front door on Park Street. Feels way too suburban.
- Site plan does not resolve all issues for all uses in a logical and convincing way.
- Need to rethink relation with Fish Hatchery Road.
- Site circulation seems overly complicated.