

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 7, 2007
TITLE: 22 East Dayton Street and 208 North Pinckney Street – PUD-SIP, Forty-Eight Unit Building. 4 th Ald. Dist. (04001)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: March 7, 2007	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Lisa Geer, Robert March, Bruce Woods, Todd Barnett, Cathleen Feland, Lou Host-Jablonski and Michael Barrett.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 7, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-SIP for a 48-unit building located at 22 East Dayton Street and 208 North Pinckney Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Gene Devitt, Capitol Neighborhoods-Mansion Hill District; Att. Bill White, John W. Sutton, Scott Lewis and Douglas Kozel. Prior to the presentation on this item, staff noted to the Commission that a PUD(GDP) for the development of this site with a future 40-unit, 5 story apartment building as a component of a PUD(GDP-SIP) allowing for the relocation of a 7-unit apartment building previously located at 18 East Dayton Street to be relocated to 208 North Pinckney Street considered by the Commission on July 26, 2006 inadvertently had not been submitted for final approval (both components) by the project's architect. Staff recommended that consideration of the second phase PUD(SIP) should also include final approval of both the PUD(GDP) and PUD(GDP-SIP) components of the first phase. Sutton and Kozel then provided an overview of the second phase SIP as currently proposed. Kozel provided a review of building architecture utilizing the model in addition to several prospective renderings. The street side elevation of the building featuring a centered arch entry. Sutton noted commitment to investigate green amenities including provisions for stormwater retention, the use of rain barrels to feed planters, a ballasted roof in some areas to reflect light up, utilization of low-flow water fixtures, the utilization of high-efficiency heat pump system in addition to the minimization of penetrations and exterior walls. Att. Bill White spoke on behalf of the First United Church's support for the project as part of this joint venture on its own properties combined with that of the applicant, Scott Lewis. Gene Devitt of the Capital Neighborhoods, Inc.-Mansion Hill Districts spoke in favor of the project as part of a whole block combined with the church's property but noted problems with a projecting staircase shaft on the west elevation of the building which should be pushed back. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Stair tower is a problem.
- The previous review of the project in conjunction with development of the adjacent church's property as part of the whole block development emphasized the excess of hardscape and still requires address. Adjacent surface parking should be redone to incorporate pervious pavers with the utilization of the green roof on the building. Do not want to see the development site all paved; want to see creative use of pavers along access drive to the north as well as adjacent surface parking areas.

- Want to see what the rain barrels look like, where they are located and how they are integrated as part of the structure.
- The base treatment of the building at the sidewalk is too dominant of an element of the building considered tiering to diminish including incorporating landscape amenities. Re-emphasis the ideal roof even a limited amount.
- The site plan is too small to read. Needs to be enlarged including providing details on grading, retaining, and other elements.
- Look at rotating the stair tower element on the westerly elevation to reduce its protrusion as well as integrate as a feature.
- The landscape plan does not correspond with other plans within the plan set update.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). At the suggestion of the Chair, Wagner, a motion for formal final approval of the first phase PUD(GDP-SIP) and PUD(GDP) for the first phase for the project was made on a motion by Barrett, seconded by Host-Jablonski, and passed unanimously on a vote of (8-0). A separate motion to grant initial approval of the current phase two PUD(SIP) was made on a motion by March, seconded by Barnett, and passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion required that the stair tower on the westerly elevation be pulled in and integrated into the façade, that a green roof be investigated in whatever form due to the site's imperviousness along with the addition of pervious pavers including amenities for an attractive plaza-like appearance for the driveway access area and surface parking along the northerly perimeter of the proposed structure.

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, 6, 6, 7, 7.5 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 22 East Dayton Street and 208 North Pinckney Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.5
	5	7	4	-	-	6	7	6
	5	7	4	-	-	5	7	6
	6	7	5	-	-	7	7	6
	7	8	6	-	-	7	7	7
	7	6	4	-	-	5	6	6
	5	6	5	-	-	6	6	6
	6	9	-	-	-	-	9	8

General Comments:

- Good urban design, good architectural design. Stair tower needs much more design attention – it’s a sore thumb now.
- Will need to include areas for infiltration of stormwater, a roof green system should be provided since there are very little landscape areas within the site. Permeable pavers in the parking areas adjacent to the residences can improve the heat reflection and aesthetics of this space.
- Nice architecture, complementary to the neighborhood. Concerns: 1) the possible over-imposing base; 2) the need for an extensive and accessible green roof.
- Handsome building. Essentially impervious site.
- Further develop the “green building” before returning for final.
- Stair needs to be better. Incorporated into building design.
- A handsome building. Could you put the stair well inside?