

## AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> May 11, 2011
TITLE: 229 West Lakelawn Place – PUD(GDP-SIP), Construction of a Fourteen-Unit Apartment Building on the Acacia House Property. 2 <sup>nd</sup> Ald. Dist. (22359)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: May 11, 2011	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, R. Richard Wagner and Henry Lufler, Jr.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 11, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 229 West Lakelawn Place. Appearing on behalf of the project were Josh Wilcox, representing Landgraf Construction; and Mark Landgraf and Kevin Page, representing Palladia, LLC. The Secretary noted that a previously approved version of a similar project on the site had difficulty in address of the PUD Downtown Design Zones Criteria. It eventually reached the Plan Commission where it was rejected. Ald. Maniaci talked about a neighborhood meeting with an area frat house residents and co-op residents that received mostly positive feedback. There was significant discussion about lighting, safety, interactions between pedestrians and bicyclists, and the possibility of Lakelawn Place becoming one-way. Alumni members of the TKE House were also in attendance; their biggest concern seems to be not having apartments stacked upon one another. Landgraf spoke to the Commission about working on this project and how he feels this is a very good site for infill, and will clean up this very important corner. Wilcox then presented the plans to include a 61-bedroom, 14-unit apartment building. Being in Downtown Design Zone No. 4 that limits this to a 5-story building; zoning allows them an extra level for a garden or basement, so long as a certain amount of it is underground. Total square foot is almost 14,000 square feet. This development will not include automobile parking, but will have parking for mopeds and bicycles, with some short-term parking available for drop-offs and deliveries. Their parking arrangements will also be available to the Acacia House, and they are in the process of working on garbage plans to integrate plans for both buildings. Rummel inquired about the main entry and how it relates to the street. She is happy with the changes to the new iterations of plans, but struggles with the number of stories of six including the partially recessed ground floor level which may not be consistent with the ordinance. Landgraf stated that because of the need for play between the Acacia House and Lakelawn, with the bike parking and trash pick-up it made sense to centralize the entrance in this corner, and utilize the other exposure and views for a terminal view. It gives them enough separation from Acacia. Smith discussed entry points, stating that without being told where they are on the presentation boards, they wouldn’t know where to find them. Overall the biggest things he finds most successful about the previous scheme was that the designer recognized that this is a background building site. When he looks at this new design, it’s too much of an unsolved Rubik’s Cube that needs to be more cohesive, simpler and more refined. The last proposal had very high quality materials that need to be carried forward with this proposal. He does not find the openings appropriate to the neighboring context. He likes that this proposal does not include vehicles,

and asked that when they come back they bring perspectives from the south, down Lakelawn, and reverse that from the west side of Lakelawn but north. Ald. Maniaci discussed the locations of entries on neighboring buildings. O’Kroley suggested the applicant study how the outdoor space works, the architecture needs to speak to the Acacia House, the Downtown Design Zones Criteria require more articulation on the architecture, do something special to acknowledge that this is taller than the Acacia House. Barnett asked that the applicant come back with comparisons to the previous plans, showing what has changed in terms of density, mass and number of units. He feels that this site contains too much and looks rather cobbled, and feels that the location of the short-term parking is an accident waiting to happen. Slayton pointed out that if they changed the back-up pattern it wouldn’t be so problematic. Rummel encouraged them to look towards the future in terms of an entrance on the street because this will set the precedent for the other two parcels being developed. Slayton said they need to go with a more urban form for this to be successful. The entry does need to be articulated quite a bit.

**ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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 rating for this project is 5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 229 West Lakelawn Place**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	4	5	-	-	-	5	5	5

General Comments:

- Address the corner.
- Improvement over last proposal but doesn't address Downtown Design Zone #4 – primary entry. Windows, approach to corner, height too tall. Relationship to Acacia needs work.
- Think background building – simple, high quality materials.