

AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: October 3, 2012

TITLE: 202, 210 North Bassett Street & 512, 520 West Dayton Street – PUD(SIP), Deconstruction of Four Buildings and Construction of a New 5-Story Multi-Family Apartment Building with Underground Parking. 4th Ald. Dist. (27838)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: October 3, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, Richard Slayton, Henry Lufner, Melissa Huggins and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 3, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a PUD(SIP) located at 202, 210 North Bassett Street and 512, 520 West Dayton Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were J. Randy Bruce and Scott Faust, representing Boardwalk Investment. Bruce presented the surrounding context and site plan for five surface parking stalls adjacent to the main building entrance, with 56 parking spaces underground, 20 moped stalls, as well as a number of bicycle stalls both underground and surface. The proposed 5-story building will complement the surrounding architecture with hardiplank siding and individual entry doors for the first floor. A series of individual planters has been combined into one area to create a usable hardscape area. Trash would be located in the front corner on the first floor so the truck doesn't have to go all the way down to empty the containers. A condensing/heating unit that is packaged as one (Magicpak) would be mostly hidden. This project will be at least "green built" LEED equivalent with consideration of a light colored roof and some greenscape on the plaza deck; stormwater will be cleaned and directed towards the storm sewers. Staff noted this is within Downtown Design Zone No. 2 and the height of the building is consistent. Bruce noted that the rear setback is greater than 25-feet with the front and side being at about 22-feet; the backyard isn't necessarily a consistent setback but the project does have a fairly deep setbacks in certain areas. He also noted that the neighborhood reaction has been positive.

- It seems like it wants more of a front door. Could the office be flipped?
 - That's something we could take a look at and make this more of a celebratory entry.
- Architecturally what were your thoughts on what you were trying to accomplish?
 - We wanted a strong masonry feel across the lower force. We can't really do five levels of brick with a wood frame backup so we're stretching it to the four stories. We want to keep it relatively simple (the massing) while still having some vertical articulation. We have recessed decks that will give quite a bit of shadow. There would be some hardiplank and some metal.

- I'd like you to get the templates for the actual trucks that will be going in here. I think what may happen is they'll drive down Dayton and back in. This obviously won't handle a semi but it will handle a lot of trucks. Just be confident because it is so tight and there will be a lot of back and forth.
- John gave me his thoughts on this, regarding the building. He would like to see something more innovative. This corner needs something more contemporary and more cutting edge. (Slayton)
- In terms of the neighborhood, there needs to be some way to communicate that the expectation of just because they like it, it could come here to this Commission and be sent back to the drawing table. And that's OK, that's part of the process.
- Staff responded that we are still dealing with Downtown Design Zones and there is still work being done on the Downtown Plan, but the applicant is required to address issues when you have a PUD. Requirements can be waived, but at the same time as part of the zoning ordinance at the informational level there has to be a solid discussion about how the project does or doesn't meet these factors, and the interior and exterior criteria that the Urban Design Commission uses to meet the standards. I don't see that happening with a lot of these.
 - That's the sort of thing that Planning staff reports could make clear. That's where the technical staff report could be very useful.

(Staff) There needs to be a lot more in depth discussion about the interior and exterior criteria from the get-go on these projects and it's not happening. It's not staff's responsibility to say to the architect this needs to be done; the architect should be doing it, that's what the ordinance says. We need to get back to that.

(Bruce) It's always tough for us at an informational level, what sort of detail you get into. We can go through that to a better degree at the next level. I'm looking at the new zoning code and the old one and trying to fit those both in there.
- In some ways this is like a modern treatment of a masonry building. There's not only the neighborhood and this Commission but there's the owner too. It's all in play. I don't think it has to be modern.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.