

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> May 23, 2007
TITLE: 1501 Monroe Street – PUD(GDP) for a Mixed-Use Project. 13 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (02999)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>POF:</b></span>
DATED: May 23, 2007	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Michael Barrett, Robert March and Richard Slayton.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 23, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of PUD(GDP) located at 1501 Monroe Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Bob Sieger and Ald. Julia Kerr. Registered in opposition to the project were Bill Chin, Thomas Yen, Fraser Gurd and Lydia Hung. Prior to the presentation staff noted to the Commission that following initial approval of the project in December of 2006, the Plan Commission subsequently referred action on the project to resolve issues with the Planning staff recommendation to place on file the application due to its inability to address the standards and criteria for Planned Unit Developments, as well as address adjoining neighborhood concerns. Since that time the applicant has consulted with staff, area Alderpersons and neighborhood associations and neighbors and has now revised the project. The revised submittal provides for a reduction in height from a previously proposed four-story with penthouse level to three-stories with penthouse level, reflecting a reduction from 39 proposed units to 24-units. The upper stories of the building also feature setbacks in combination with other modifications. Presenting the revised plans, Sieger noted the following:

- Downsizing of the development makes the previous traffic study which supported greater densities more valid.
- The previously proposed lower level 120 parking stalls is to be maintained with issues relevant to the family definition, units to students and subleasing, as well as the use of outdoor space further restricted within the text.
- The building materials are generally as was with the larger version of the building with the exception of the elimination of the use of ping glass on the material palette with the incorporation of the use of exposed smooth concrete.

Ald. Julia Kerr spoke neither in support nor opposition, but noted concerns raised at public meetings relevant to the revised proposal as follows:

- Concern with the proposal's compliance with the recently adopted Monroe Street Commercial District Plan which supports four-stories with the possibility for five-stories at a maximum of five-stories.

- Issue with covering windows on the adjacent Mickey's apartment building, concern with rear elevation's relationship with adjacent single-family development.
- Concern with outdoor patios/balconies in relation to heavy traffic on Monroe Street and Regent Street; no people, same design as currently which is not used.
- Relevant to the traffic study issue, the mechanics of the drive entry into lower level parking is still problematic, especially the potential blockage of Regent Street with left-hand turning movements.
- There is a general feeling that the building is too big as it relates to the surrounding existing development.

Representatives of the Madison Chinese Christian Church spoke at length relative to issues with the leasing of their property by Sieger for accessory parking purposes. Staff noted that a lawsuit filed on behalf of the church by Attorney Michael Christopher was noted in a memo to the Mayor, as well as to staff as grounds for requesting referral of the project. According to an email opinion of the City Attorney's Office, as long as the Commission felt that the on-site level of parking proposed with the property being rezoned was not at issue, consideration of the project should proceed as requested. Members of the church also requested a more inclusive traffic study relevant to providing information on p.m. traffic movements, in addition to an emphasis on pedestrian circulation.

Following input at the hearing the Commission noted the following:

- In comparing the proposal with the current architecture relative to the previous had more character. The current proposal introduces a cantilever roof which needs more study.
- The parking entry is located where it needs to be, not on the street.
- The current version is a good solution that deserves initial site and overall concept approval with the architect to work out the appropriate details.
- The height and mass address the street but architecture suffers. The massing is right on.
- The argument on traffic and turning movements not compelling.
- The detailing and architecture on the south and alley elevation need to be worked out, especially the utilization of smooth finish cast concrete walls needs to be reexamined.
- The image and detailing of the façade an issue.
- The alley portion of the building lacks windows in the elevational renderings, inconsistent with the model.
- Traffic a bit of a concern especially turning left off of Regent Street. Study utilizing using a right turn out movement.
- Placement of tree at the corner apex a safety issue with pedestrian crossing and right turning cars from Monroe to Regent; move the trees further down Regent.
- The building is scaled nicely where the entry plaza will enhance and enliven the building, along with activity at two levels or stories but still feel that there is too much parking.
- Like building better, its proportions and character. Use of red and yellow glass a bit jarring, doesn't integrate well, an attention getting effect.
- Corner element is bothersome, it appears squashed, previous version had a corner element that turned the corner better. The corner element needs to be different than the balance of the building; treatment needs to rise to the occasion to be designed at a strong unified tower element, needs to be something special at the intersection.

## **ACTION:**

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by March, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion for initial approval required address of the above stated concerns and the following:

- Retry at architecture in regards to articulation and detailing of the building façade, for example, the integration of vertical columns and patterning is weak.
- Clarify use of exposed fine finish concrete with more rendering and detailing.
- Bring landscaping into the alley area utilizing columnar varieties, vining, etc.

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, 6, 6, 6, 6, 7 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1501 Monroe Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	6	5	-	-	-	6	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	6	6	5/4	-	-	5	7	6
	6	5	-	-	-	5	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	5	6	6
	7	6	5	-	-	-	-	-
	8	6	6	-	-	6	8	7
	5	8	-	-	-	6	9	7

General Comments:

- Like scale and proportions of this proposal better than previous. Architectural details need refinement per our comments.
- This project, despite the furor, is quite appropriately scaled and massed. Architecture needs work yet. Good infill and urban sensitive design.
- Consider landscaping along alley if open spaces can be created – columnar trees will fit.
- Site seems alright now that building is shorter. Corner needs to be more dynamic and tweak the architecture.
- Outstanding issues: fire lanes, sidewalk widths, pedestrian connections.
- This is scaled right for this location. The splashes of color add interest, and the open entry plaza marvelously connects private space with public.
- South and alley elevations are of great concern – very harsh roof edge doesn’t seem resolved. Height is fine, corner element needs development.
- Appropriate use for this site.