# **AGENDA#6**

## City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PRESENTED: October 18, 2006

TITLE: 1135 Erin Street – Amended PUD(GDP- **REFERRED:** 

SIP) for 40-Unit Cohousing Project. 13<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (03106) **REREFERRED:** 

REPORTED BACK:

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

DATED: October 18, 2006 **ID NUMBER:** 

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair, Cathleen Feland, Lisa Geer, Todd Barnett, Michael Barrett, Robert March, Ald. Noel Radomski and Bruce Woods.

#### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of October 18, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of an amended PUD(GDP-SIP) for a 40-unit cohousing project located at 1135 Erin Street. Host-Jablonski abstained and was excused with consideration of this item. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jim Glueck, John Merrill, Dirk Herr-Hoyman, Steve Silverberg, Janet Kelly and Cynthia Sampson. Upon initial presentation of this item, John Merrill, President of the Co-housing group spoke to the Commission relevant to the required changes to the project based on cost and affordability now proposed. Glueck provided further details on the modified plans as follows:

- The site plan is basically the same, including the array of building materials such as fiber cement siding, brick and asphalt shingles, the overall landscaping amenities, unit count and proposed parking levels. Glueck asserted that the revised building design of both the Orchard and Erin House buildings was necessary to be more efficient because of cost.
- He emphasized the changes in roof configuration with both structures, noting that the Erin House building features the elimination of flat roofs but maintained stoops to the street, where the Orchard House building features a step roof line higher on upper portions of the street and lower downslope on the street.
- The modified proposal provides for the development of 13-units within the Erin house structure and 16-units in the Orchard house structure, reflecting a loss of 1-unit from the project as previously proposed, combined with maintenance of existing structures on the combined site and the development of a 3-unit structure in coordination with Habitat for Humanity of Dane County.
- Enhanced roof configuration of the building features an alternative for the provision of solar panels, which have yet to be confirmed as part of the development.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

• Discussion relevant to the request for initial approval of the project emphasized that initial approval is for basic site plan with issues relevant to building architecture of concern requiring further address.

- The high pitched roof (12/12) is extremely tall, increases building height with different architecture vocabulary; question the appropriateness of the roof form in the area. High pitched roof will block a lot of light in the open space area.
- Troubled with the street side 12/12 gable elements.
- Disappointed with the loss of LEEDS certification as previously proposed.
- The building design as modified is missing the whimsy of the previous proposal.
- Look at east elevations exposed façade's blank appearance.
- In order to relieve heaviness of roofline, consider creating an off-set with one gable element from another; main versus smaller.
- Look at the lower elevation roof treatment on the Orchard House structure.
- Provide alternatives to the pitches of roofs as proposed.

## **ACTION**:

On a motion by March, seconded by Geer, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion required address of the above stated concerns.

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. 5, 7, 7 and 8.

#### URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1135 Erin Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	7	6	6	-	-	7	7	7
	7	6	6	-	-	8	8	7
	-	6	-	-	-	-	6	6
	6	5	6	-	-	6	6	6
	8	8	-	-	-	8	9	8
mber	7	6	7	7	-	8	8	6.5
Me								

## General Comments:

- Nice to see co-housing that is at least partially a green building.
- Reconsider 12/12 pitch gables, and/or reduce mass of large gables.
- Roof pitch, mass concern.
- LEEDS was promised, not delivered. Interesting urban architecture promised, a suburban apartment building was delivered. Pretty disappointing.