AGENDA # <u>3</u>

| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | | PRESENTED: November 16, 2005 | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|------|--|--|
| TITLE: | 33 South Broom Street – PUD(SIP), | REFERRED: | | | |
| | Twenty-Three Unit Condominium Component of "Capitol West." | REREFERRED: | | | |
| | | REPORTED BACK: | | | |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary | | ADOPTED: | POF: | | |
| DATED: November 16, 2005 | | ID NUMBER: | | | |
| | | | | | |

City of Madison, Wisconsin

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Lou Host-Jablonski, Lisa Geer, Robert March, Ald. Noel Radomski, Todd Barnett, Michael Barrett, and Cathleen Feland

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 16, 2005, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(SIP). Appearing on behalf of the project were Thomas Miller, Attorney Bill White, Ed Freer, Rosemary Lee, Stefanie Moritz, Michael May and Nathan Novak. The project architect spoke on the encroachment issue and agreement with the Capitol West Steering Committee, Bassett District, Capitol Neighborhoods, Inc., relevant to the encroachment of proposed balconies within the 13-foot Broom Street setback and the fifth-story mezzanine proposed for atop the four-story structure. The agreement between the neighborhood and the developer provides that the fifth-story mezzanine is to be removed, that proposed balconies along the West Washington Avenue elevation of the structure will not extend across the property line, and that two of the five balcony stacks along the Broom Street elevation allowed to encroach four feet within the 13-foot setback (02, 03, and 05 units). A presentation of the pallet of building materials and colors was provided, as well as an overview of the site plan and elevation details. Following the presentation, as well as comments by various speakers in favor of the project's achieved compromise, the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- Issue with existing adjoining parking structures' aggressive lighting levels negatively impacting this new residential development. Existing lighting fixtures within the ramp should be replaced with fully shielded fixtures. The applicant noted they will try to pursue the issue with Meriter, who will maintain its use of the ramp until 2012.
- It was noted that the loss of rooftop terraces from the fifth-floor mezzanine level and extended balconies reflected a negative loss of amenities affecting the overall design aesthetic.
- The project, as currently proposed, is a lost opportunity to mitigate an urban heat island affect with the loss of the green rooftop terrace.
- Concerns were raised with exposed HVAC pipes on roofs and sides of the building. The applicant noted that they will be screened with attempts made to prevent any wall intrusions.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Host-Jablonski, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion required that architectural grilles for the "magic pack" units be provided with a light colored roof to reflect the heat and the parapet to be same materials on its face as well as its back face.

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, 8, 7, 7, 7, and 8.

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

General Comments:

- Project reduced from an "A" to "B" with deletion of mezzanine and "unusable" balconies. Great material mix!
- Excellent use of a difficult site handsome building.
- Professional ongoing maintenance for the cedar, EIFS and landscape is an important element for approval and needs to be ensured. Very attractive details and lights.
- Major missed opportunity to reduce the urban heat island effect with the loss of mezzanine's rooftop garden and balconies.
- Thanks for cooperating with the neighborhood.
- Shrinking balconies is unfortunate. Penthouses would have been great.