

## AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> May 25, 2011	
TITLE: 3502 Monroe Street – PUD(SIP). 10 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (22566)	<b>REFERRED:</b>	
	<b>REREFERRED:</b>	
	<b>REPORTED BACK:</b>	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b>	<b>POF:</b>
DATED: May 25, 2011	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>	

---

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, R. Richard Wagner, Melissa Huggins and Jay Handy.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 25, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(SIP) located at 3502 Monroe Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Mark Landgraf, representing Parman Place, LLC. Randy Bruce gave a brief overview of the site including photographs of the surrounding neighborhood. He noted that two neighborhood meetings were very well attended with over 100 people attending the first meeting. This current proposal is 3-stories placed tight to both Monroe Street and Glenway Street and wraps the corner on Wyota. The first floor will consist of retail with vehicular underground parking with 18 parking stalls below and 9 surface parking stalls, plus a loading zone. A balcony stretches the entire back of the building. A roof terrace will be available to the tenants. Multi-colored masonry will be used to break up the façade, with fiber cement on the upper levels. The color scheme was chosen because of the site’s proximity to the Arboretum. Huggins commented that this reminds her of the Empire Photography project they just reviewed and she finds this design very uninspired. She would challenge the development community to come to the Urban Design Commission sooner, before they go to the neighborhood and residents get “attached” to a particular design. Landgraf replied that developers are always told to talk to the neighbors before they come to any commission and that’s exactly what they did. She said her frustration comes down to process, not the project; she thinks it’s important to balance neighborhood participation with professional expertise. Barnett also finds it frustrating that the process doesn’t always work the way it should. He said he finds the site plan, building use and placement is all terrific. He is worried however that this has too many architectural elements and could be a repeat of other problematic designs such as Trader Joe’s. It doesn’t have to be modern but it’s too busy for a small building. Smith noted his attendance at the neighborhood meetings and reiterated this point by stating that a neighbor asked why every building has to look like 20 smaller buildings. The buildings near Michael’s Custard are background buildings with nice brick detailing and plenty of room for all the storefront signage. He sees this as a great opportunity for that same kind of treatment. He would like to see something more simple and cohesive. He appreciates the fact that it is 3-stories and sets a precedent for the inevitable redevelopment in this area. Slayton stated that the landscape plan and the building façade should be coordinated. O’Kroley liked the scale and massing as appropriate to the neighborhood. The architecture feels one-dimensional to her; she would encourage some cohesive concept for the building which can include varied massing or expression of individual storefronts. She does not find the style appropriate to the historic architecture in the neighborhood. Rummel talked about the process of meeting

with neighborhoods before coming to the Commission and how important that is. She was struck by how different the front of the building was from the back. Bruce then told the Commission that at the last neighborhood meeting where most people approved of this design, he did inform them that the Urban Design Commission would have comments and possible changes and that he would keep the neighborhood informed along the way. Smith would like to see something more cohesive and not so many design ideas on one building; he would like them to talk to their client about that.

**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, 7 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 3502 Monroe Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	6	7	6	-	-	6	7	7
	5	5	5	-	-	6	6	5
	6	4	-	-	-	-	9	7

General Comments:

- Site is perfect. Architecture is mundane.
- Too busy, front and back of building really different.
- Nicely scaled building with high quality materials. 3 story design sets a good precedent for the block.