

## AGENDA # 12

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> April 22, 2009
TITLE: 602-630 East Johnson Street, 309-323 North Blair Street, 601-625 East Gorham Street – PUD(GDP-SIP) for the Renovation of Existing Residential Housing and New Residential Development. 2 <sup>nd</sup> Ald. Dist. (13998)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b>  <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: April 22, 2009	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 22, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 602-630 East Johnson Street, 309-323 North Blair Street, and 601-625 East Gorham Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Helen Bradbury and Richard Arnesen, representing Stone House Development; Ald. Bridget Maniaci, District 2; Richard Linster and Patrick McDonnell, both representing the Tenney-Lapham Neighborhood Association; Michael Matty and James Roper. Prior to Bruce's presentation, staff noted to the Commission comments from Rebecca Cnare, Acting Preservation Planner, relevant to the Landmarks Commission's action at its meeting of April 20, 2009. The Landmarks Commission recommended that the houses not be demolished because of the number of houses and the context of the houses on the block. The Landmarks Commission also recommended that the Plan Commission require the applicant return to the Landmarks Commission for review of each of the proposed rehabilitated houses or that the applicant applies for Historic Tax-Credit Certification and that the Plan Commission should consider the impact of the proposed green space plan as part of the Fourth Lake Ridge National Register of Historic District for its required open space."

Bruce followed noted that Kitty Rankin, the now retired Principal Planner, following a tour of the properties, had no objection to the proposed demolitions. Bruce remarked that the PUD, as currently structured, provides for Urban Design Commission review and approval of any of the exterior modifications to the homes to be rehabilitated as part of the scope of the project. He further noted that Landmarks' approvals of the same aspects would be a duplication and preference for maintaining UDC approval for rehabilitation of housing to be maintained. Bruce summarized a list of recent modifications as a result of the neighborhood planning process as follows:

- More courtyard space for the easterly building.
- A relocation of loft areas to the terminal ends of the buildings or end elevations.
- Reduction in internal wall heights to reduce the appearance of over height of the buildings, in addition to the matching of eave lines consistent with adjacent existing housing.
- An attempt to match building height in scale to adjacent existing structures on Gorham Street.

- One public entry added on Blair, two on Johnson along with one for each end building. The minimum porch width is 7' x 10' for individual units as well as public entries.

Following Bruce's presentation, testimony from the public was as follows:

- Object – project too big, building too massive compared to adjacent homes across the street.
- Object to use of green space from historic homes; no space on site outside of that period.
- Support 40-50 units, not 80+ units per acre. Not consistent with adopted neighborhood plan where density is too high as proposed, but appreciate Michael Matty's work with historic homes.
- In support of neighborhood association's planning process with the project.

Following testimony, Ald. Bridget Maniaci spoke in support of the project, noting that the existing housing to be demolished is in a class of its own, very problematic with the sites contain very little usable lot area, poor housing stock in poor condition. Maniaci noted her appreciation for the design, which features entries and stoops to the street, as well as the overall plan.

Discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- Bothered by hardscape separation between existing and proposed development, need more interaction between a broad expanse of hardscape and green area with more visual access and landscaping that bridges the edge with overarching trees.
- Make more of an event of the connections between the historic and new at both stairs adjacent to the central pedestrian corridor.
- Make curvilinear path more fluid.
- Adjust westerly bike parking area adjacent to Building #1 to not absorb available space.
- Use a 19<sup>th</sup> century curvilinear form with path, as well as landscaping, in addition to reducing its width to five feet.
- The middle building's projection and minor projection of the pinches the central open space corridor and adjacent courtyard areas.
- Want to see how gardens are defined; might need a large garden.
- Need to deal with on-site rain water issues, storm water issues, for example, gray water; recycle roof water.
- Need to see solar application details to lock in; provide consideration for solar water heating.
- Center building massing is problematic. It impinges on the circulation through to the lake and pedestrian corridor across the site.
- Need to see bulk and mass studies, including a bird's eye view study and individual building street perspectives.

Discussion of members continued following the motion to provide for initial approval. Issues with the granting of initial approval with the need to address provisions that affect the overall bulk, height and building location issues were noted to be mitigated with the project as currently proposed and modified as a response to issues addressed with the neighborhood planning process.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Luskin, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion required address of landscaping and design concerns relative to the central open space and corridor. The motion also instructed the

applicant to look at the on-site stormwater issues, including the recycling of gray water. The motion noted the need to find utility for former student housing due to development of alternative student housing on the Isthmus; where the project and neighborhood weighing of the issues does a good job of dealing with housing strategy and issues along with reinvestment within the area.

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, 6, 6.5, 6.5, 8 and 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR:** 602-630 East Johnson Street, 309-323 North Blair Street, 601-625 East Gorham Street

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

General Comments:

- Support project due to neighborhood process.
- Improved connections to Blair and Johnson are very successful.
- Building fronts are nicely articulated but massing, particularly of center building, seems too much. Stormwater solutions need to be addressed.
- Path flow/alignment needs refinement.
- Study bringing landscape through to Johnson and treat the space between the buildings as a space. Look at east stair and relationship to drive. Study how pavers terminate at east, will this space be used? Encourage applicant to reduce mass to allow more space at garden wall.