

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: April 11, 2007
TITLE: 1815 University Avenue – Demolition and Development of a 64-Unit Apartment Project, PUD(GDP-SIP). 5 th Ald. Dist. (05949)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: William Fruhling, Acting Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: April 11, 2007	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner (Chair); Richard Slayton, Ald. Noel Radomski, Michael Barrett, Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett and Bruce Woods.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 11, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** a PUD(GDP-SIP) for demolition and development of a 64-unit apartment project located at 1815 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Steve Brown, Patrick McGowan, Sarah Reiter, Laurel Brown and Joe Hanauer. McGowan reviewed changes in response to the last review by the Commission:

1. Retail uses are not believed to be feasible, so were not included;
2. Setbacks were increased by 1-foot along Princeton Avenue and by 2-feet on floors 2-4 in the rear;
3. The building height was reduced by 2-feet;
4. The terrace was pulled back 2-feet along University Avenue and landscaping was enhanced;
5. EIFS was eliminated;
6. Dark brick is used in recessed areas on the front façade; and
7. The balconies were removed above the front entrance.

Reiter reviewed the 18-month public process. Jeffrey Spruill, Shane Fry and Tim Wadlington registered in support. Phillipa Claude, Will Waller, Louisa Waller, Lynn Gilchrist, John Koffel, Hilde Neujahr, Barbara Lewis, and Pamela Atkins registered in opposition. Several letters of support and opposition were also submitted. The concerns generally focused on the lack of adequate setbacks and open space, as well as the visibility at the intersection of University Avenue and Princeton Avenue. Ald. Robbie Webber stated that, while there is quite a bit of neighborhood support, setbacks seem to be the major issue and asked if it was possible to rearrange interior space to gain additional setbacks. She also noted that this is a historic district with high standards and there is a concern about this project setting a precedent. Fruhling clarified that the Landmarks Commission did have some concerns about setbacks, but since that is not a specific historic district criterion, they felt that the rhythm of masses and spaces was appropriate to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

The Commission discussed the following:

- The appropriateness of fiber cement siding;

- The size of the parking stalls and drive aisles and whether these could be reduced somewhat to result in greater setbacks;
- The layout of the interior spaces and whether they could be reduced somewhat or rearranged;
- The adequacy of the landscaping along the rear property line and whether it would provide an effective screen.

ACTION:

On a motion by Ald. Radomski, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** a PUD(GDP-SIP) for demolition and development of a 64-unit apartment project located at 1815 University Avenue. The Commission noted that the referral was to:

1. Explore reducing the dimensions of the parking stalls and drive aisles to determine if greater setbacks can be achieved;
2. That brick be utilized on all of the Princeton Avenue façade and the southern most projections on the rear façade;
3. Reconsider fiber cement siding on the center portion of the rear façade, replacing it with more economical brick or masonry; and
4. Explore ways to increase the sight distances at the intersection of University Avenue and Princeton Avenue.

The motion was passed on a vote of (5-1-1) with Barrett voting no and Wagner abstaining.

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, 5, 5, 5 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1815 University Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	5	5	5	-	-	5	5	5
	3	4	2	-	-	5	5	4
	5	7	4/5	5	-	4/5	6	5
	4	6	6	-	-	-	5	5

General Comments:

- Really, just a little too big. The applicant has some flexibility, concept-wise, if only they'll embrace it. The neighborhood would appreciate it.
- Lack of adequate greenspace (see Wrigleyville in N. Chicago for examples of a good balance between greenspace and density) and lack of neighborhood supporting retail make this a bad fit for this truly urban neighborhood.
- Fiber cement is not acceptable. Setbacks seem fine now. Please, please retail.
- Building should be all brick, no siding. Work with rear neighbor about fence and landscaping.