

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 7, 2012
TITLE: 725 & 749 University Row – PUD(SIP) for University Crossing, Buildings 4 and 6. 19 th Ald. Dist. (25413)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: March 7, 2012	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, Melissa Huggins and Henry Lufler, Jr.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 7, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(SIP) located at 725 and 749 University Row. Appearing on behalf of the project were Scott Kammer, Richard Carlson, representing The Bruce Company; Brian Reed and Eric Lawson, representing Potter Lawson Architects; Doug Hursh, representing University Crossing, LLC; Paul Lenhart, Faith Fitzpatrick, representing the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association; and Ald. Mark Clear, District 19. Hursh discussed Building 1, which is under construction right now for UW Health. Minor changes to the GDP include about 65-units in the concept plan to about 115-118 units in the apartment building; units that were on the perimeter have turned inward and face the green roof. On the hotel site they want the ability to do a mixed-use office/commercial/retail type building that would only be four stories and roughly 60,000 square feet. Parking counts would vary depending on whether the building is built as a hotel or as mixed-use. Parking would be shared with the residents and office users. Internal streets are being made as City streets. The apartments surround the parking structure with a green roof and a level of parking that goes down below the apartments. Kammer discussed Building 4 (office/mixed-use) that sits at the corner of University Avenue and Whitney Way. The vertical expression addresses the intersection, large picture windows address the intersection from the building within and looking at it from the street. Landscaping helps bring the scale down to the pedestrian level. An internal courtyard plaza area is also planned. They are seeking LEED Gold on this development which includes harvesting stormwater, sun shades to harvest the sunlight, basement parking as well as three showers for users of the building, along with toilets and lockers. Building materials are brick masonry in a copper tone with other materials mixed in, terra cotta panels and a charcoal color metal panel. Reed then presented the apartment Building 6 in the center of the development. Parking occurs on the lower two floors with one floor of parking on the first floor. There are five stories exposed on the west side and four stories exposed on the east side. The lowest level would be retail or mixed-use office component with four stories of residential above. Landscaping along the sidewalk will soften the edge a bit more. Balconies are recessed where a fiber cement panel will be introduced to warm up the palette and make it a bit more residential in nature. Residential entry points are at both the east and west ends of the building. The courtyard has been redesigned to a more park-like setting, with the possibility for sculptures, natural grasses and light canopy trees to allow perennial growth.

Faith Fitzpatrick spoke as a representative of the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association. They are concerned with stormwater issues associated with this development, in particular the Phase 2 Design Landscaping Plan,

there is an opportunity to infiltrate the roof water; they would like to see more detailing on that. They are also very appreciative of the green roof and rooftop garden. They remain concerned with the storm drains with a direct connection to the lake and Spring Harbor and they want assurance that the drains are protected on the inside as well.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I'm concerned that the brick be at least 8 inches.
- Please look at locations of benches, both in the development and on the sidewalk to help with the urban setting, as room allows.
- The site lines to the green roof are fantastic. It's an excellent development, the double height glass spaces not being flanked and subtly creates motion. The idea of the framed second story piece with eh glass corner is going to draw people in, it's very successful.
- What are the stormwater plans?
 - We're trying to get as much roof infiltration as possible. We're collecting water from that roof which also reduces water going into the stormwater, which wasn't calculated into the stormwater system for the overall master plan, so we're reducing the amount going into that system. The green roof was also not part of the original design.
- It might be nice to have a little pocket where someone can get off the path and be in an area. For shade purposes you might be prepared to include some type of trellis or arbor.
 - We've looked at sort of an outdoor living space.
- One thing that troubles me about this is the sameness. This is democratic and pleasant enough but it could be really exciting. Please get rid of all the spirea and find something else. The handful of crabapples are fine. This building is so strong and masculine and spirea is so Shell gas station. Figure out a way of adding landscaping variety to give differences to the context and grades.
- 80% of the species listed are not indigenous. Shorter grasses would not require watering; blue grass is not sustainable. Your University Avenue has a nice soft feeling that blue grass is not going to give you.
- How far apart are the trees spaced along University Avenue? You're got a big avenue here, if you want those trees to make any kind of statement here you need to put them closer together. That's a huge space you're trying to have those trees command. At 58-feet apart, you should go down to 40 or 45-feet apart.
- To the extent that your building materials are similar to this other area, consider that as a continuation also.
- I would go with something other than Day Lily that will complement the prairie drop seed, something that has a certain natural feel to it. The Day Lily has a certain connotation that does not work with the building.
- I've not had good luck with prairie drop seed, Siberian Iris may work.
- Bike parking?
 - For the office building it's along the street, also for the retail/mixed-use component, and in the basement of the office building there are bicycle parking stalls, as well as in the apartment building.
- You could enhance the roof pattern by using some fine aggregate that would complement the shape of the paths, just add another way of interest to that to cut back on some of the lawn. The detail of what we're commenting on is indicative of how close you are on this.
- In the residential part, strong design and a strong landscaping design. But what about residents who might want to use pots and make it their own space. Think about working that in as well.
- If you pursue native grasses you'll have to think about connectivity from the doors to the ribbon.
 - One thing we did want was the ability to do a small recreation zone, to have some kind of lawn where you could do that.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0).

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, 7, 8, 8.5, 9 and 9.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 725 & 749 University Crossing

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	7	8	6	-	-	6	8	7
	6	6	5	-	-	6	6	6
	9	9	9	8	-	8	9	9
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	7	7	7	-	-	7	7	8.5

General Comments:

- Great project.
- Poster child for strong, thoughtful, skilled design.
- Excellent Phase 2 proposal. More than the sum of its parts!

Firchow, Kevin

Subject: Comments on University Crossing Landscaping Plan for 4/4/12 Plan Commission meeting

From: Faith Fitzpatrick <faithfitz@sbcglobal.net>

To: tparks@cityofmadison.com; district19@cityofmadison.com; jnichols@cityofmadison.com

Cc: Herman Felstehausen <hhfelste@wisc.edu>; Dick Pearson <dick@pearsonengineering.com>; Brett Hulseley <Bretthulseley@charter.net>; Greg Hull <greg@gmhull.com>

Sent: Wed, April 4, 2012 7:45:04 AM

Subject: Comments on University Crossing Landscaping Plan for 4/4/12 Plan Commission meeting

Hello,

I have some comments concerning the landscaping and plant choices related to University Crossing Phase II development. I could not find updated landscaping plans on the City's website and these comments reflect the March version on the plan. These comments reflect site runoff and stormwater control as well as plant choices.

These suggestions are not required by city code, yet I hope the developer and the City Plan Commission will consider them given the sensitivity, setting, and great potential for University Crossing. Sensitivity--because of the proximity to the lake, harbor, springs, and City well across the street from the development. Setting--in regard to the naturalized hillside backdrop of prairie at Owen Park conservancy and the oak woods of Crestwood, Highlands, and Spring Harbor neighborhoods. Potential -- in being the development that becomes the latest talk about town for soil, water and vegetation treatments for low impact development. This is such a great location and a little additional effort and thought in the landscaping will go far in terms of stormwater/LID and people appeal.

The landscaping plants should be integrated with the bioswales/bioretenention planned to infiltrate rooftop runoff and route water from parking lots to the bioretention basin. It is very surprising not to not see these in the landscaping plan. The plant choices presented at the last Plan Commission meeting had a couple things going against them -- they are reminiscent of the 1980s "university resarch park, aka commercial feel" plus they are not appropriate for swales and promoting maximum infiltration. The daylily choice for the very prominent wall corner were a tipoff to the disappointing design and plant choices.

There are multiple guidelines and examples for planting beautiful native grasses, flowers, shrubs and trees in bioretention areas in cities across the U.S., especially Minneapolis and Milwaukee (for example Pabst Brewery -- http://v3.mmsd.com/AssetsClient/documents/procurement/rfp/rfp_20120316091921.pdf). There is no need for any of these types of features to be mowed grass, instead they will have more benefit if they are appropriately planted with trees, shrubs, and forbs. See <http://itd.idaho.gov/pdc11/docs/Stormwater%20Retrofitting%20Along%20Linear%20Projects.pdf> (especially toward the end) for examples. Additionally, we've seen now with the site opened up that the grade and onsite source of sand are very conducive for regenerative stormwater conveyance (shallow subsurface flow through sand-lined channels and swales) that can filter and slow the runoff and eliminate the need for the expensive new stormwater pipes that will send dirty water quickly into Spring Harbor. http://media.clemson.edu/public/restoration/scwrc/2010/abstracts/t3/bergj_scwrc10_extabstr.pdf.

Consider the recent publication by Stephens et al. in the February 2012 issue of the Journal of American Water Resources Association, showing the importance of infiltrating stormwater in LID projects and the opportunity to recharge nearby sensitive and already stressed springs such as those surrounding Spring Harbor.

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2011.00600.x/abstract>

This article is especially pertinent as it shows the lack of evidence for perceived threats to ground water quality.

I would strongly recommend that the developer add more of the yellow dolomite/limestone of the area, so prevalent along the shoreline of Lake Mendota here and in the old quarries. This will give it a more softer/natural look and be very complimentary to the color choices for the buildings. Consider a mix of native evergreens -- white pine, spruce to compliment the rock color. We've had much success with white pine in Spring Harbor Park and our huge population of owls love them. Also plenty of hawks would use them that reside in the area near the golf course. Please consider a dense spacing on the plantings will give it a great look fast.

Respectfully,

Faith Fitzpatrick
Spring Harbor Neighborhood