

## AGENDA # 14

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** April 9, 2008

TITLE:    31 South Henry Street – PUD(GDP-SIP) to      **REFERRED:**  
             Remodel in Existing 3-Story Structure and      **REREFERRED:**  
             Adding 3 Additional Stories to  
             Accommodate 58 Apartment Units and  
             5,000 Sq. Ft. of First Floor Commercial      **REPORTED BACK:**  
             Space. 4<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (09853)

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary      **ADOPTED:**      **POF:**

DATED: April 9, 2008      **ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Bonnie Cosgrove, Richard Wagner and Jay Ferm.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 9, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 31 South Henry Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were David Ferch, Peter Ostlind, representing the Bassett District Capital Neighborhoods; and Michael May representing the Bassett Neighborhood Steering Committee. The project provides for the redevelopment of an existing building, the former St. Raphael Cathedral school and convent. Proposed to remodel existing three-story masonry building and add an additional three floors vertical for a total of six. The upper stories will remodel into an apartment building with the first floor having commercial rental area, possibly a restaurant. Ferch then provided a review of the proposed three-story addition to the existing structure, in combination with site improvements. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Great infill opportunity, building too light/light on top.
- Like filling in on corner and public views but also opportunity for entry on corner to restaurant/commercial space a missed opportunity.
- Prefer not to see EIFS materials, suggest metal panel or some other alternative.
- Brick panel at corner could be more transparent.
- Building is an interesting shape, like courtyard but don't necessarily need to carry over brick EIFS treatment of top.
- Accept discontinuance with change of top treatment. Look at vertical columns outside of the building with something different on the upper stories.
- Relevant to landscaping could do more in courtyard than proposed, create a low or high ceiling with plantings.
- Problem with boxwoods in pots, need to be in the ground.
- Place bike storage at Henry entrance.
- Look at second area to work with streetscape better along Henry Street.
- Make addition at corner taller, a two-story element.

Peter Ostlind, representing the Bassett District Capital Neighborhoods spoke noting that the concept was well received where the broader neighborhood has not seen the plan. Ostlind further noted concern with the addition at the corner not looking tacked on along with problems with an overhead and blank door on the Henry Street façade, visitor bike parking, moped parking, in addition to the effect of a proposed curb cut for a dumpster taking out two badly needed on-street parking stalls. Michael May, also of the Bassett Steering Committee Capital Neighborhoods noted issues with exposed cooling towers on the roof, problem with the use of a light shade of EIFS on the proposed upper story addition, as well as the need to resolve bike access issues.

### **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 4 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 31 South Henry Street**

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

**General Comments:**

- Interesting reuse. Like changing entry to West Washington. Top of building/new construction should address architecture and materials – landscaping opportunity for courtyard. Work-man-like start – make it pop, with west park and art in courtyard.
- Corner entry? EIFS not appropriate for this location. Leading corner along West Washington might be nice more transparent.
- Need better solution for bike storage.
- Potted plants will not survive the winter – consider beds. Nice addition to neighborhood.

## AGENDA # 15

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> April 9, 2008
TITLE: 6350 Town Center Drive (Lot 4, Metrotech Plat) – PUD-SIP for an Office Building. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Ald. Dist. (09841)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: April 9, 2008	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Bonnie Cosgrove, Richard Wagner and Jay Ferm.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 9, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 6350 Town Center Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Daniel J. Helwig and Fred Campbell. The project provides for a major alteration to the PUD-GDP for the retail/commercial center as part of the “Metrotech” development. It is the applicant’s desire to develop a dental office on the site as part of a phased development. The applicant’s presentation failed to provide the Commission sufficient context on the overall development plan for Metrotech and the area as a whole, including existing residential development within the area. The applicant’s main emphasis was to provide for only feedback on the design components on the first phase of development only. Staff noted that more detailed review of the project was not possible in the absence of the required context information in regards to the overall development plan for the area, as well as existing and proposed development. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Bring green strip down middle by shortening parking stalls within the parking area for Phase I.
- Entry on street is underscaled.
- Make the pedestrian entry from the street a genuine main entry, get it separated from the dental clinic internally.
- The overhang and canopies extend into the required build-to line, need to provide further details as to bike parking for both phases.
- With Phase I simplify the parking lot with a double loaded arrangement to eliminate and reduce the amount of pavement.
- Bring topography plan to deal with the possibility for on-site bioretention feature along the building’s west side.
- Look at adjusting elevation at rear to get a better floor to floor relationship that allows for a better pedestrian entry at the front from the street side of the building.
- Minimize the use of EIFS, look at windows that maintain a strong horizontal line.

## **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, 5 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 6350 Town Center Drive**

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

General Comments:

- Need context/GDP plan – explain next time. Address stormwater, parking lot landscaping. Appreciate relationship to street, enhance street entries.
- Make street entry a genuine main entry.
- Provide context and requirements.