

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> December 15, 2010
TITLE: 416, 420, 424 West Mifflin Street – PUD(GDP-SIP) for a 45-Unit Apartment Building. 4 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (19953)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: December 15, 2010	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton\*, R. Richard Wagner and Jay Handy.

\*Slayton recused himself on this item.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of December 15, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 416, 420, 424 West Mifflin Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were John Bieno, representing TJK Design Build; Scott Kolar, representing Mifflin West District, CNI; Robert Keller and Patrick McCaughey. Bieno provided a summary of alterations to the design of the building façade in response to the Commission’s previous review of September 22, 2010. He and the developer, Pat McCaughey noted that a request to reduce the height of the building from four stories to three was economically infeasible due to construction and land assembly costs. Bieno presented details of the revised building elevations noting that the interior floor plans for individual units have been modified to allow for windows within all bedrooms as evidenced by the consistent fenestration of windows on all elevations. The individual elevation emphasized an intended break up of the mass of the façade, in addition to utilizing recess balconies.

Ald. Verveer spoke on the issue of the lack of an opportunity for a full blown neighborhood meeting on the project because of scheduling and timing issues outside of meetings between the applicant and the neighborhood steering committee. He requested that this presentation be for informational purposes only. He further noted that the scheduling for both Plan Commission and Common Council consideration on this item would allow for the necessary delay with formal consideration by the Urban Design Commission in the future. Following the presentation the Commission noted:

- The proportions of brick on the front elevation needs attention in contrast with the variety of other materials; need to pick one more over the others; much going on, not enough change in plane. Look at how change in plane correlates with change in color and materials.
- Look at shed roof element on bump out versus entry’s gabled end treatment; wants to be flat.
- Use another alternative material for base to be more pedestrian, not block.
- On front façade where roof crosses, change in materials; disconnect, need individual roof elements.
- Use of block around garage door; too massive, beyond base.
- Move staired entry further left; not to be next to the other at grade entry.

- Elements and treatment of the back elevation (west) are more successful than front elevation (east) which is too broken up. The front should be designed to be more in between.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by O’Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the project contingent on the applicant addressing the comments concerning architecture, roof discharge, garage and base materials not to be block and as a result of a future neighborhood meeting to be held by Ald. Verveer if any concerns with the bulk, mass and height of the project as proposed are raised the Plan Commission should refer the project back to the Urban Design Commission for further consideration. An initial motion by Handy to grant initial approval failed for lack of a second with another motion for referral by Rummel to allow for a neighborhood meeting prior to any consideration also failed for a lack of a second. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0-1) with Slayton 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 5.5, 6 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 416, 420, 424 West Mifflin Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.5
	5	5.5	6	-	-	5	7	6

General Comments:

- Simplify architecture.
- Much improved – UDC’s conditions should address neighbor’s/Alder’s concerns about lack of meeting with nearby residents.
- Much improved, could be better architecturally.