

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 2, 2005
TITLE: 33 South Broom Street – PUD(SIP), Twenty-Three Unit Condominium Component of “Capitol West”	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: November 2, 2005	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner – Chair, Todd Barnett, Michael Barrett, Cathleen Feland, Lisa Geer, Lou Host-Jablonski, Robert March, Jack Williams, and Ald. Noel Radomski

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 2, 2005, the Urban Design Commission **REFERED CONSIDERATION** of a 23-unit condominium component of “Capitol West” located at 33 South Broom Street.

Appearing on behalf of the project were Thomas Miller, Nathan Novak, Ed Freer, Rosemary Lee and Bill White. Providing information and speaking was Peter Ostlind and Michael May. Appearing in opposition to the project was Ledell Zellers. The plans, as presented by Miller, featured a development of a four-story building with an upper mezzanine level on the site with balconies for the upper three floors encroaching into a 13-foot setback area between the front of the building and the Broom Street right-of-way; in addition to ground level patio areas. A review of the landscape plan and lighting plan details combined with building elevations, building materials and colors was provided in relationship to the integrated palette for the previously approved PUD-SIP developments for Capitol West. Following the presentation, Ledell Zellers spoke in opposition relative to incursion of upper level balconies of four feet into the reduced setback of 13 feet on Broom Street. She felt the incursion reduced flexibility for future use of the setback and recommended its rejection. Ostlind spoke as a member of the Bassett District, Capitol Neighborhoods Steering Committee, noting that the neighborhood had yet to take action on the modified proposal scheduled at an up and coming neighborhood meeting. He recommended that the Urban Design Commission receive this as an informational presentation and refer further consideration of the project. He also noted issues raised within a memo distributed to the Commission from the Capitol Neighborhood Steering Committee citing several issues with the project. Issues range from the departure from a previously three-story structure to a four-story structure with mezzanine, the incursion into the 13-foot setback, loading vs. parking issues, and maintenance of proposed building materials. Ald. Verveer appeared and spoke relative to the setback issue and ongoing process in preparation to officially map the Broom Street Corridor and establish some parameters for the setback. May appeared as representative of the Bassett Neighborhood Steering Committee, further elaborating on the incursion into the setback issue, the loading zone vs. off-street parking issue, other changes to the PUD development, as proposed, and the problem with the extent of white stucco and its maintenance as proposed on the facade of the structure.

ACTION:

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by Barrett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED CONSIDERATION** of the project. The motion was passed on a vote of (9-0). The motion for referral required working out issues with the neighborhood association and clarification of the 13-foot setback issue along Broom Street, future use and reservation.

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 3, 6, 6.5, 7, and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 33 South Broom Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	7	7	-	-	-	7	7	7
	6	5	6	6	-	7	6	6
	-	7	-	-	-	6	7	6.5
	5	8	-	8	-	7	7	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	7	7	7	6	-	7	7	-

General Comments:

- Balconies are fairly innocuous, however, neighborhood and developer need to come to some sort of compromise.
- Correct inconsistency between architecture, floor plans, landscape plan, site layout, specifically patio, walks. Consider paves in some areas.
- Nice architecture. Council needs to be more clear its intention vis-à-vis permitted obstructions in the 13' setback.
- Balconies acceptable but mezzanine detracts from the architecture.
- Developer needs to property negotiate with neighborhood.
- Architecture is quite handsome but developer and neighborhood need to compare discussions