

**AGENDA # 3**

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** January 4, 2012

**TITLE:** 202 & 206 North Brooks Street –  
PUD(GDP-SIP), Five-Story Residential  
Building with Fourteen Units. 8<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist.  
(24171)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

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

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** January 4, 2012

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett and Melissa Huggins.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of January 4, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 202 and 206 North Brooks Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Joseph Lee, representing JD McCormick Companies; and Ryan Kolar. Lee presented changes to the 5-story building. The lower level contains underground bicycle and moped parking and mechanical storage. Brick and metal panels will be used as the primary materials on the building’s façade with the residential entry is along Brooks Street.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Have you looked at the existing housing and whether they can be relocated and reused?
  - They are in pretty sad condition. They are in disrepair and the chances of moving them are slim to none; they also do not have any landmark value.

At some point you need Plan Commission approval for demolition and you have to prove that those buildings are not feasible. The ones we can save we should really try.
- What are the problems, listing walls, water in the basement?
  - Water problems in the roof and basement, seepage of the wood structure with sagging floors, wood cladding that’s in disrepair.
- No automobile parking?
  - Not other than on-street parking.

Most student projects I’ve seen have at least some automobile parking under the building.

  - The cost is not feasible for the number of spaces we would achieve. These units are going to be marketed to UW students who would bike and/or walk.
- I’m struggling with the change in patterns on that corner. Maybe think about simplifying that pattern and materials.
  - Our opinion is it does read as a vertical element.
- I like the massing and detailing. My first reaction was this was a little busy, but I like the playfulness and edginess. I like that the pieces are not the same width. The contrast on those panels is actually not enough.
- I wonder if there is a way to treat the windows a little bit differently than the ones above so there’s a greater sense of protection enclosure.
- I think the fiber cement materials are fine.

- With the change in pattern the canted form needs to be looked at. Some of your material differences are very subtle. That wedge should be its own material and color. I can't tell from the material board to the display which color is what.
- If you take the angled piece and make it one color, I think that will strengthen the detail you have everywhere else.
- You don't have a landscape plan. I am concerned about what happens outside the sliding glass doors to unit 101. I'd rather see a usable patio secured with a fence but it's a very usable space for the people who would have that apartment. Control access to the patio from the sidewalk.
- Is there a plan for a blue roof or a green roof?
- Is your signage going to be lit?
- You're going to need some kind of arrangement with the City to use the street, you have no drop-off or loading zone.
- When you study your materials and colors, think about how things turn the corner, so instead of being a pasted on application it can feel like an element that people can understand.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided for the following:

- Investigate the railing or patio areas, landscape plan and material samples for the fiber cement with either updated renderings or alternative materials consistent with the renderings.
- Look at the edges of the corner element (wedge shape) as one color and bring back alternatives.
- Investigate options for on-site stormwater management.
- Provide better views of all sides of the site.
- Study how materials turn the corners of each elevation.
- Prefer material colors represented in the renderings over that display on the sample board.

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, 7, 7, 7 and 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 202 & 206 North Brooks Street – PUD(GDP-SIP)**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	8.5	7	-	-	7	-	7	7
	-	7	-	-	6	-	7	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	7	7	-	-	-	7	8	7
	-	7	-	-	7	6	8	7

General Comments:

- Nicely done.