

AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: July 26, 2006	
TITLE: 1501 Monroe Street – PUD(GDP-SIP) for a Mixed-Use Project with 51 Units. 13 th Ald. Dist. (02999)	REFERRED:	
	REREFERRED:	
	REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: July 26, 2006	ID NUMBER:	

Members present were: Lisa Geer, Acting Chair; Ald. Noel Radomski, Todd Barnett, Cathleen Feland, Michael Barrett and Robert March.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 26, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) for a mixed-use project with 51-units located at 1501 Monroe Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Bob Sieger. Appearing in opposition to the project were Ald. Robbie Webber, Atty. Michael Christopher, Sam King, Thomas Yen, Philip Wang, Bill Chin and Jane Riley. Appearing neither in support nor opposition were Julia Kerr and Audrey Highton. Prior to the presentation, staff and Ald. Radomski noted a request by Ald. Golden to refer further consideration of the project based on issues of communications by the applicant with various adjoining neighborhood associations, aldermanic representatives whose districts are immediately adjacent to the site (Ald. Golden and Ald. Weber) as well as issues with the area's Ald. Isadore Knox, Jr. who was unable to attend due to health issues. The project as presented by Sieger featured the following:

- A discussion on concerns relevant to height as it relates to the neighborhood, parking and circulation issues.
- A summary of neighborhood communications and contacts provided for the record.
- A review of plan details, including elevations and model, featuring a reduction of the height of the building including a stepback to the adjoining neighborhood.

Following Sieger's presentation, various representatives of the "Madison Chinese Christian Church" spoke in opposition to the project, including their attorney Michael Christopher, noting problems with an existing long-term lease parking arrangement between the church and Sieger, allowing for daytime use by Sieger's commercial tenants of the church's parking, unauthorized use by Sieger's commercial tenants during church use periods and conflicts with the use of a shared alley. Other neighbors registered on this item expressed concerns about the bulk mass and density of the project, as well as traffic, parking and circulation concerns. Ald. Weber spoke on issues with the larger neighborhood scope of the project noting that it was inappropriate for the Commission to take action, with issues with properly organized meetings with adjoining neighborhoods with proper notice yet to be provided and parking issues. Julia Kerr, representing the Vilas Neighborhood also requested referral, noting the need for properly noticed public meetings on the project necessary to let the neighborhood have a chance to look at the project before any Urban Design Commission action. Attorney

Christopher spoke of the need for a meaningful transition from commercial to residential, the issue of height, traffic issues and the project's inconsistency with plans for the area.

ACTION:

On a motion by Feland, seconded by Ald. Radomski, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0). The motion to refer noted that the neighborhood process was still at issue and that the applicant should go through proper channels to resolve issues with the neighborhood prior to any further consideration of the project, provide a proper traffic study including address of pedestrian/bike issues, as well as a shadow study to provide answers relevant to the building's proposed height.

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, 6.5 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1501 Monroe Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	4	5	-	-	-	4	5	4.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	-	6.5	-	-	-	-	7	6.5
	8	-	-	-	-	-	8	8

General Comments:

- Continue communication with neighborhood and traffic. More thorough study.
- Applicant needs to work with Alders and neighbors to convene a meaningful meeting. And to resolve massing, scale and density issues and parking and vehicular/ped-bike circulation. Shadow study too.
- Makings of a nice project.
- Need more neighborhood input.
- This needs to go through proper neighborhood channels.
- Resolve parking issues, shadow height.