

AGENDA # 13

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: April 22, 2009
TITLE: 2 South Bedford Street – PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development. 4 th Ald. Dist. (13295)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: April 22, 2009	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Mark Smith, Todd Barnett, Dawn Weber, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Ron Luskin and Jay Fermi.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 22, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 2 South Bedford Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were David Meier, Michael May, representing the Bassett Neighborhood Steering Committee of CNI; and Rosemary Lee. Bruce provided the Commission with a summary of modifications to the mixed-use development on the site currently occupied by the “Badger Bus Depot.” Following this presentation the Commission noted the following:

- In regards to stormwater management, look at incorporating green opportunities.
- Realize that parking resources are necessary and scarce, but provide at least one full canopy tree and island within the surface parking area.
- There is an issue with the landscaping proposed adjacent to the face of the building to the south and its ability to grow in limited light and space. A minimum of 8-feet would be required with the switch grass as proposed won’t grow where the arborvitae and sumac will grow in a minimum of 4-feet which is not provided. Under all circumstances it does not look good unless a minimum of 6-foot planting strip is provided.
- The drive-in location and configuration needs study; issue with queuing.
- Big building for site and neighborhood where the West Washington façade building’s façade needs more attention.
- Adjust landscaping strip adjacent to the southerly lot line and adjacent building 2-feet wide with adjustments for vining and ground cover type plantings including provisions for a growing grid.
- Provide for adjustment of landscaping abutting the south façade Building #2 to provide for enhanced landscaping amenities adjacent to the rear of the residential building and grid vining on the adjacent building to the south.
- Important to maintain the proposed use of brick and cast stone on all buildings as proposed.
- Use the 3-story roof at Main Street to be a roof deck for the adjoining upper level units on Building #2.

Michael May read an advisory statement from the Bassett Neighborhood Association noting issues with the density and height of the 5-story at Bedford and West Washington; where plan supports 4-stories with height at the rear of the building. May noted traffic and parking concerns, the need for a group of financing before any building demolitions, the need for signage to be complementary to the architecture, along with the need to

maintain street trees on the site's perimeter. The advisory statement was circulated to the Commission. Rosemary Lee spoke in support of the project as good urban infill. Ald. Michael Verveer spoke in favor noting that the adopted Bassett Neighborhood Plan does support a 5-story structure along with concerns as to landscaping and lack thereof, and the need for parking in a parking-deficient area. Following testimony discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- Bring more detail on the West Washington building's façade and entryway.
- Provide more immediate context with adjacent existing development.
- Reconsider the plantings on Bedford Street, especially the use of Viburnum and Amelancher, in addition to consideration of a different ground cover.
- Prior to consideration of utilizing the roof of Building #3 as rooftop balconies for adjoining Building #2, consider combining active use with green roof elements.
- Look at something more distinctive with the bridge treatment between Buildings #1 and #2.
- Consolidate accessible parking to the west or create more of a greenspace at the rear of Building #2.
- Consider changing the top treatment of Building #2 with Building #1.
- Use the allocation that allows for 25% compact parking stalls to create more landscape greenspace.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Ferm, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion required the address of the landscaping issues, green roof/access to roof comments, as well as more details on on-site stormwater issues.

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, 6.5, 7, 8, 8 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2 South Bedford Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	6.5	7.5	5	-	-	6	7.5	7
	7	8	-	-	-	6	8	8
	5	7	5	-	-	5	7	6.5
	5	7	5	-	-	5	7	6

General Comments:

- Excellent.
- Wonderful, dense and totally appropriate project for the 4th Ward and West Wash.
- Really need to find a place for a canopy tree.

AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: January 21, 2009
TITLE: 2 South Bedford Street – PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development. 4 th Ald. Dist. (13295)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: William A. Fruhling, Acting Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: January 21, 2009	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bruce Woods; Chair, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, Ald. Marsha Rummel, Ron Luskin, Dawn Weber, Mark Smith, Richard Wagner, Jay Ferm, and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 21, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(GDP-SIP) for a mixed-use development at 2 South Bedford Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Randy Bruce. He stated that the project consists of approximately 13,000 square feet of commercial space and 84 apartment units in two buildings (that will read as three buildings) ranging from 3-5 stories in height. He stated that they are looking at using the rooftop of the 4-story building as open space for the residents. He also stated that the owners are studying the operational options for continuing inter-city bus service.

The Commission generally expressed support for the design direction, and the discussion focused on the following issues:

- The amount of open space and whether the buildings should be pulled back slightly from the street to allow for more landscaping along the building edge.
- Opportunities for greenspace on the interior of the site in addition to the rooftop.
- The importance of developing the architectural details, and not losing them as the design evolves, to ensure this historic design direction will be successful.
- Exploring whether the connector between the buildings could be more of an asset to the project – like making it wider for meeting spaces for building residents.

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 7, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2 South Bedford Street

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

General Comments:

- Genuine historic façades? Or fake and flat? Great urban context response. Townhouses – great idea!
- Green roof – views from roof? Modern elements? Very nicely crafted.
- People are asking where an inter-city bus terminal will be located. This must be resolved before this project moves forward. Talented architect.
- Good use of site! Nice fit with area context.

reasonable. She felt that they should not be arbitrary, noting that 25% is two times the current level. Eric Sundquist said that the 25% figure was only a goal at this time, and that it would likely be refined over time (after further evaluation).

The LRTPC then voted to recommend adoption of Resolution ID 13815 (as amended), on a vote of 8-2 (Sup. Melanie Hampton and Bob Schaefer voted "no") on a motion submitted by Ald. Satya Rhodes-Conway/Ald. Robbie Webber.

5 14029

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES PERTAINING TO INTERCITY PASSENGER TRANSPORTATION AND POTENTIAL MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION STATION/TERMINAL IN THE CITY OF MADISON

Ald. Paul Skidmore/Gary Poulson submitted a motion "to refer the agenda item to a future LRTPC meeting, but to focus the discussion on a potential multi-modal terminal somewhere in the downtown area". The motion passed unanimously.

Several members of the public wished to speak on this agenda item, and commentary was limited to 3 minutes apiece.

David Knuti (615 West Main Street, #301) said that the Badger Bus depot is an important asset to the entire community. He asked that the redevelopment proposal be paused for a full review of the issues. He hoped that a multi-use facility could be considered in the downtown area. Mr. Knuti said that a City study of the issue is in order. He handed out some resolution language that could be used in the future, should the Commission or certain alderpersons wish to advance the idea.

Ald. Paul Skidmore pointed out that the depot is private property and does not receive City of Madison subsidy to conduct its business.

Barbara Smith (Madison Peak Oil Group) said that the proposed redevelopment of the Badger Bus depot is a concern to her and her colleagues. She felt that it is a valuable facility for the City and that more planning should be done to address multi-modal needs in the downtown area. She felt that a multi-use facility should be considered. She also said that street loading is undesirable for many residents, noting concerns with weather, safety/security, and dealing with cash transactions in an unsecured environment.

Royce Williams (2437 Fox Avenue) said that multi-use transportation facilities in other communities function very well. He urged the City of Madison to explore what other places have done. He also agreed that street loading is a problem for many people, especially elderly and disabled people.

Susan DeVos (610 North Midvale Boulevard) said that Wisconsin Department of Transportation's Connections 2030 Plan calls for an intermodal terminal in the downtown area. She said that this is an important asset to the community and should be maintained. She said that the depot serves a quasi-public service and that the City of Madison has an interest in keeping this type of facility in operation.

Rob Kennedy (UW-Madison, Transportation Services) said that the current situation (street loading) at Memorial Union has its challenges, but seems to be working all right. However, he said that an increase in that type of activity is a concern to the UW - both at Memorial Union and South Campus Union - and that follow-up evaluation will need to take place.

Ed Blume (Madison Peak Oil Group) said that oil is a finite resource and that world supplies all fossil fuels will continue to become more scarce (and costly). He said that alternatives to driving (including intercity bus service) will become even more important in the future, and that it is short-sighted to allow a depot of this type to be lost. He urged the Commission to further explore a multi-use transportation hub in the downtown area.

John Meier (Badger Coaches) said that the intercity bus business has been changing rapidly, especially over the past 10 years. He said that he is in danger of experiencing competition from very low cost service providers (such as Megabus), many of whom do not maintain the overhead costs of a depot facility (and are mainly street-loading operations). He said that 90% of Badger passengers load at Memorial Union and Greyhound (another depot user) has been struggling. He said that online ticketing is the wave of the future. He noted that closing the depot is a difficult business decision that he has been forced to make at this time.

Ald. Robbie Webber asked Mr. Meier to provide some details about his operation and passenger profile. John Meier said that he operates 6 trips per day out of Madison, and the vast majority are picked up at Memorial Union (and most are University students). He said that the buses stage at the Union for 12 minutes each trip. He said that Greyhound operates about 12 buses per day out of the depot facility.

Ald. Tim Gruber asked if Badger Coaches would utilize a central terminal facility, if one were to be developed. He also asked Mr. Meier where he felt one should be located, if so. John Meier said that it should be located near the UW Campus, but he did not have any other suggestions.

Ald. Paul Skidmore asked Mr. Meier a number of questions about his operations in the City. Mr. Meier confirmed that he pays taxes, does not receive any City subsidies and that his costs have been rising dramatically (especially fuel and labor costs). He said that a new bus costs \$550,000. Meier also pointed out that he works with the Madison School District and Madison Metro to provide some services. Finally Mr. Meier said that he would like to develop his property, rather than sell it to the City (or another entity) or continue to operate a depot there.

Eric Sundquist asked how his operation would change after the depot is closed. John Meier said that he hoped to have a street loading operation at UW, Dutch Mill Park-and-Ride lot, and possibly somewhere near the State Capitol.

Mike Rewey asked if Badger Coaches would be contributing to the operating costs of the Dutch Mill park-and-ride lot. John Meier responded that, at this time, he did not have such an arrangement. Mark Shahan asked about the Capitol area and whether or not a location had been selected for street boarding. Mr. Meier said that he did not have a preferred location at this time.

Ald. Robbie Webber asked Rob Kennedy if the UW was satisfied with the street boarding at Memorial Union. Kennedy replied that, at this time, the

arrangement is working but that additional activity would be a concern, and that pedestrian and bicycle safety is very important in that area. Mike Rewey felt that the bus traffic in the Memorial Union area is a problem at this time.

Ald. Robbie Webber asked about the current rules for intercity buses loading along the street. Ald. Paul Skidmore said that the Pedestrian-Bicycle-Motor Vehicle Commission would be the proper committee to address those arrangements. He added that Traffic Engineering staff would need to be involved in those discussions.

Ald. Skidmore felt that it was not appropriate to restrict Badger Coaches' business decisions. Ald. Tim Gruber said that he supports the concept of a multi-modal transportation facility, or hub, and that the Monona Terrace area and the Kohl Center area should be explored further. He also said that the loss of the bus terminal should not be a factor in the Plan Commission's review of the redevelopment project on the Badger Bus depot site.

Ald. Robbie Webber said that Badger Coaches (and Greyhound) needs to have more detailed discussions with the City of Madison and the UW regarding the future changes to intercity bus operations after the depot closes. She also supports the concept of a central transportation terminal.

Carl Durocher agreed that such a terminal facility is need, and added that private property is often taken for highway projects.

6 14030

**REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF ISSUES PERTAINING TO POTENTIAL
FUTURE REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY IN MADISON AND/OR
DANE COUNTY**

Royce Williams wished to make some comments on this agenda item. He said that he is in favor of using the MPO planning boundary as the RTA boundary, but that the governance of the RTA board is an important issue that needs further consideration. He felt that the MPO Board is a good example of regional governance and could be looked at as an RTA model. He expressed concern regarding the fact that the RTA board was not elected, and hoped that Dane County Supervisors could become more involved in RTA governance.

David Trowbridge said that the purpose for placing this item on the LRTPC agenda at this time was to provide an overview of the recent RTA legislation contained in the Governor's Budget proposal. He said that he would like the Commission to develop some issues of concern regarding the City of Madison and a possible new RTA (such as Metro's role in a new RTA) so that they might be addressed as this legislation is being considered.

Trowbridge handed out a map showing the Madison Area MPO planning boundary, which is being proposed as the boundary for a new RTA. Bob McDonald (Madison Area MPO) explained that, every ten years (after the Census data is released), the boundaries of the Madison Urbanized Area (and planning boundary) are updated. He said that the U.S. Census determines the Urbanized Area boundary.

Bob Schaefer said that an earlier RTA agreement between Dane County Executive Falk and Mayor Cieslewicz included some funding for streets and highways, but that this is not included in the Governor's budget. He said