

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: May 5, 2010
TITLE: 1208, 1212, 1214 Spring Street – PUD(GDP-SIP) for an 8-Story Apartment Building. 8 th Ald. Dist. (16968)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: May 5, 2010	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Richard Wagner, John Harrington, Jay Ferm, Ron Luskin and Mark Smith.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 5, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1208, 1212 and 1214 Spring Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Christopher Gosch of bark design, representing Gebhardt Development; Christopher Thiel, Dave Martin and Jeremy Oliyotti. Gosch presented plans and spoke on precast issues which were further qualified by Martin and Oliyotti, including a discussion on finish quality and color of the precast panels with samples as distributed. A major change was switching over to a metal panel with prefinished metal awnings and capping with painted metal grate railings on balconies. Bike parking and visitor scooter parking was added to the front to address the landscape plan. Grasses and native vegetation will be used to emphasize the rhythm of the building. Parking and access are through the back of the building. The pavers on the terraces will be picked up in the plaza to tie them together. On the roof will be some slow release detention. The green roof that was previously discussed is not in the budget. It is proposed to use a turf block, or grass paved system for bike and scooter parking as a more sustainable solution than just pouring concrete. Zoning and parking requirements were discussed. Further discussion included green roof amenities, lighting, stormwater detention and local product use. Countertops will use recycled materials. Comments by the Commission were as follows:

- The north elevation of the building does not address the change in scale. The north face may lose that if it’s purely one plane.
- The balconies should be 5-feet rather than the 4-feet depicted to make them more usable. It was noted they are smaller to prevent large groups from gathering on them.
- Well done.
- The precast samples are lighter in color than the drawings and boards. Look at making color bolder.
- We generally do require 5-foot balconies to make them usable. 4-foot balconies can often become storage zones rather than a used zone. Look at making them 5-feet to avoid bicycle storage.

Further comments included:

- Use caution on the plant selection. Concern with maintenance.

- Consider more impact with the landscape plan, more contemporary. When you mention natives, make sure they're native.
- Concern that the color will make the building look like a giant concrete block. Everything fades.
- Address is too far up from the street and too small for pedestrian traffic.
- Concern with bike rack locations being out of the way. Rethink where bike parking can go.
- Rethink number of bike racks at the front of the building, along with the seating.
- Concern with taking away what can be public space with bike parking.
- Agree bike stalls should not be in back. Explore having it on the south side of the building closer to Spring Street.
- Impressed with your presentation, graphics, sensibility of the project, terrific. Need to see more architecture. There are a lot of details in the renderings that are not detailed in the documents.
- We will want to see the actual color and material that will be put on the building in order to give final approval.
- Concern with color variations in renderings and samples. Colors samples shown not bold.
- Try to get a little more accurate with your materials for final approval.
- Plans and elevations are not coordinated. There is a level of detail that is missing from the plans.
- Try to anticipate how people will move through the area and use it; need to show.
- Provide mow strip where lawn meets building, grey or charcoal grey.
- Roof should allow for addition of future green roof structurally.
- Use small hole pavers.
- Use bolder scale and treatment of landscaping, for example a line of one type of planting or tree, etc.
- Make sure native plantings are really native.
- Need to make sure there is enough difference in precast colors so when they fade it doesn't look like a big concrete building.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion for initial approval required the following:

- Provide actual materials and color samples that will be utilized on the building.
- Final approval will require inclusion of the perspective renderings along with making sure that all building elevations are sufficiently detailed to reflect their features.
- Elevations should show the profile of the penthouse so we know the massing and materials of the penthouse.
- Further information for color studies.
- More specific architectural details on the project, including changes in plane as detailed with the perspective renderings.
- Further investigation on the use of hanging bike racks.
- Provide accessibility to the roof.
- Minimum dimension of 4'6" (highly encourage 5') so the balconies are not used as storage spaces.
- Encourage a 2-foot strip of a green roof around the space to enliven it.
- More extensive site plan that shows connection of where people should go, shouldn't go, and will go.
- Provide 8-16 bike stalls within easy access of the front door.
- Study moving the interior northeast bike parking stalls to someplace more secure and safe.

- Resolve issue with north elevation's punched square windows; out of character, look at another proportion, out of place.

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 5, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 7, 7 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1208, 1212, 1214 Spring Street

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

General Comments:

- Use more color. Bring street context views. Like effort so far.
- Just a little bit of green roof please.
- We need to see a lot more detail in regards to the architectural elements. Context renderings are a must for final approval.
- Planting along west out of context with building (more contemporary and larger scale needed). Architectural style very good and excellent scale.
- Exterior bike parking needs work to be safe, convenient and adequate in quantity. Nice project. Good attention to energy efficiency.

AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: March 17, 2010

TITLE: 1208, 1212, 1214 Spring Street –
PUD(GDP-SIP). 8th Ald. Dist. (16968)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: March 17, 2010

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Dawn O’Kroley, Jay Ferm, Mark Smith, Todd Barnett, Richard Wagner.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 17, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1208, 1212 and 1214 Spring Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Christopher Gosch, architect and Joey Bunbury, representing Gebhardt Development. Appearing neither in support nor opposition was Gary Brown. Gosch provided an overview of the site plan in regards to the building’s footprint, noting the elimination of a previously proposed sunken courtyard at the entry in favor of an at-grade entry, in addition to the fact that the pervious area of the project as proposed is equal to or no greater than that currently proposed. He further noted the plans consistency with the adopted Regent Street-South Campus Neighborhood Plan; the project as currently proposed provides that the building does not exceed 8 stories in height. The project features 87 apartment units consisting of a mix of 1-4 bedroom units with a final mix to be determined at a later time. Gosch detailed perspective renderings of the building and discussion with the Commission on the project. Brown spoke to the site’s inclusion within the University Master Plan area, which supports development of an academic facility on the site based on the University’s long-term needs. He further noted the University is not to acquire the site and expand into the area in the long-term. In response to issues raised relevant to the site’s proximity to the University Biofuel Plant, Brown noted he did not believe there would be conflicts with its development for residential purposes.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Provide details on the parking level versus the grade at entrance to the building. Gosch noted that specific elevational details would be developed.
- The parking should be provided at one bike stall per bedroom. The applicant with an emphasis on stackable bike parking.
- Like graphic presentation but need to see sample with color of precast consistent with proposal as well as examples of existing buildings.
- Consideration should include all colors and materials including all floor plans, each provide some details relevant to the specific design of all four building elevations including proposed material and color palette beyond the concepts displayed within the perspective renderings.

- Perspective renderings and proposed elevations should provide for consistent delineation and identification of the project as proposed.
- In response to question of garbage storage, Gosch noted its inclusion at the parking level where details were requested to be provided.
- The fascia treatment on the building looks a little heavy.
- Suggest transparency on balcony surround to some degree.
- Concern with the wash of color with precast over time. Look at the use of metal panel as an alternative.
- Show what happens on stair exiting the patio, including landscape plan details. Provide a landscape plan.
- Look at guest bike parking at 8-10 stalls including guest scooter parking.
- Next time provide information on the setback and its detailing at the fourth floor and how it is treated. For example, a green roof, a reflective roof, provisions for delayed discharge, provide details on upper roof deck accessible for tenants.

ACTION:

On a motion by Smith, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The project was referred with the applicant instructed to provide floor plans and confirmation of building materials and colors, with details supported with required building elevations and renderings, along with providing a landscape plan. The lack of details resulted in the referral and prevented the Commission from making an informed decision on the project. It was further noted that the project was moving in the right direction but required more attention to detail such as the need to see details on roof treatments, and address the concern with the potential for fading of color concrete. It was further noted to provide the requirements associated with initial approval of the project within the application packet with further consideration.

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 5, 6, 6, 6.5 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1208, 1212, 1214 Spring Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating	
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.5	
	5	6	-	-	-	5	6	5	
	8	8	-	6	-	6	10	8	
	6	7	4	-	-	5	6	6	

General Comments:

- Great start. Crisp, skilled design.
- Good start, interesting infill.
- Excellent start. Need more detail for initial.
- Architecture is 3D, not 2D. Building setbacks are welcome. We need more detail on floor plans, materials, etc.



Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
Attorneys at Law
One South Pinckney Street
Suite 700
Madison, WI 53703
P.O. Box 1806
Madison, WI 53701-1806
Phone 608.257.3501
Fax 608.283.2275
William F. White
Direct 608.283.2246
Email wwhite@michaelbest.com

May 21, 2010

Nan E. Fey, Chair
City of Madison Plan Commission
c/o City of Madison Department of Planning & Development
Room LL-100
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Madison, WI 53709

Re: Rezoning of 1208/1214 Spring Street
Legislative File ID #17780

Dear Chair Fey:

We represent Otto Gebhardt, III, and Gebhardt Development LLC, the owners and developers of a 75 unit apartment building at 1208-1214 Spring Street. This matter will come before the Planning Commission on Monday evening, May 24, 2010, for a public hearing and approval of Planned Unit Development zoning classification for the development. We urge approval of the development at that time.

This development would replace a single-family home, a 35 unit rooming house and a 14 unit apartment building with an upgraded energy efficient residential facility consisting of an 8 story, 75 unit apartment building. The development is consistent with the City of Madison's Comprehensive Plan. The University of Wisconsin, through its Director of Campus Planning, Gary Brown, has indicated that the University's Master Plan calls for an academic facility on this site. The site has been previously offered for sale to the University but the University declined to acquire it. Mr. Brown has indicated that the University does not object to the development.

The project received final approval from the Urban Design Commission on Wednesday, May 19, 2010. We believe that this project advances the quality of student housing on campus, is consistent with the City's and the University's plans, and will provide additional quality housing for our students in the City of Madison. We urge approval on Monday evening.

MICHAEL BEST

& FRIEDRICH LLP

Nan Fay
May 21, 2010
Page 2

If there are any questions concerning the project, please do not hesitate to contact me at 695-4946. Otherwise, we look forward to seeing you on Monday evening.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP



William F. White

WFW:cmm

cc: City of Madison Planning Commissioners
Bradley A. Murphy, Director
Tim Parks
Alder Bryon Eagon
Allan Martin
Otto Gebhardt, III

Q:\CLIENT\013770\0003\B2308415.10
5/21/10 9:18 AM