

## AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> November 7, 2007
TITLE: 119, 123 & 125 North Butler Street and 120 & 124 North Hancock Street - PUD(GDP) for a New 38-Unit Apartment Building with the Retention of Two Existing 2-Unit Buildings. 2nd Ald. Dist. (06302)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: November 7, 2007	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Chair; Marsha Rummel, Bonnie Cosgrove, Bruce Woods, Richard Clayton, John Harrington and Jay Ferm.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of November 7, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** a PUD(GDP) for a new 38-unit apartment building with retention of two existing 2-unit buildings located at 119, 123 & 125 North Butler Street and 120 & 124 North Hancock Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were James McFadden, Fisher Development; Att. Buck Sweeney, Axley Brynelson; Gene Devitt, Phil Hees, James Madison Park District Steering Committee; Ilse Hecht, and Ald. Brenda Konkel, District 2. As an update to the Commission McFadden provided a summary of activities on the project since the Commission's rejection at its meeting of July 11, 2007. McFadden noted that several modifications have been made to the project in response to the Commission's prior comments where in subsequent meetings with Planning staff it was suggested that the project return for further consideration for further review of modification in address of previous issues. McFadden then provided an overview of the various changes to the development emphasizing details as to the green roof structure of the below grade enclosed parking facility within the building, along with enhanced details providing context as to the building's bulk and mass, as well as architectural detailing in juxtaposition with existing residential development on the block. Following the presentation Eugene Devitt noted his objection to the project as proposed, referencing previous statements with prior consideration of the project relevant to building mass being inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood, its disruption of a historical intact block, issues with the height and mass of the building not fitting in with the rest of the neighborhood, the use of the midblock for below grade parking as part of the building inconsistent with the character of the block, as well as original houses, in addition to the porch and lower level exposed units inconsistent with surrounding adjacent residential structures. He further noted the houses to be demolished could be restored. Att. Buck Sweeney spoke in favor of the project and distributed a petition in favor of the project signed by adjoining neighbors, and provided further elaboration on the architectural improvements on the project since previously proposed. Ald. Konkel spoke in opposition, noting that the project was getting better, she did not support citing issues detailed by Devitt at this and the prior meeting. Konkel also noted the massing of the building does not fit into the block; the building is out of character and pushes the envelope for massing compared to adjacent structures, including issue with raised basement unit, as well as access issues. She further noted problems with development of the structure across mid-block and problems with neighborhood communications, including

concerns with building mass, height and density, not desired for neighborhood in light of the need for more planning to guide and support neighborhood redevelopment in the area where the project fit is in the wrong direction for the neighborhood. Following testimony the Commission noted the following:

- The raised structure is still out of scale with the neighborhood.
- Still provides for mid-block development, establishes a poor pattern for future development.
- Building changes character of a former single-family area.
- Building is out of scale with adjoining homes; issue of alternative to what will fit in context with the block.
- Don't buy argument that if approved will happen everywhere.
- Konkel further noted problems with combination in width and height of building exceeding everything on the block, effecting three blocks combined together where adjacent development maintains structures on individual lots with porches an issue and their prominence on side and front elevations inconsistent with the extent on adjacent residential structures.
- The through block development will disrupt patterns of existing residential development; need to resolve impact of increased vehicular access between two houses; can't support this project as proposed.
- As designed too massive, doesn't fit in context with neighborhood, more massive than adjoining, too high.
- On fence relevant to support of the project. The building's size encroaches on the street, leans on adjoining houses.
- Too many things wrong with basic approach of design; too abrupt of a change.
- Design issue is less critical than the policy issue about what guides redevelopment of the block.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Woods, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1) with Rummel voting no. The motion cited the need for the neighborhood to establish a policy issue as to where and what it feels about what the guidelines for redevelopment are for support of redevelopment in this block and area.

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, 4, 4.5 and 5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 119, 123 & 125 North Butler Street and 120 & 124 North Hancock Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	4	5	4	4	-	4	5	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	5	5	5	-	-	4	4	4.5
	4	6	3	-	-	3	5	4

General Comments:

- Bad precedent for intact block of single-family housing. Scale and massing out of proportion. Traffic impact.
- Problematical. Neighborhood needs to step up and be clear.
- Through-block design is problematic in this neighborhood.
- The structure itself is fine, but it is not clear that it fits into the neighborhood – or that it could.