

AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 17, 2010
TITLE: 1208, 1212, 1214 Spring Street – PUD(GDP-SIP). 8 th Ald. Dist. (16968)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: March 17, 2010	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Dawn O’Kroley, Jay Ferm, Mark Smith, Todd Barnett, Richard Wagner.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 17, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1208, 1212 and 1214 Spring Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Christopher Gosch, architect and Joey Bunbury, representing Gebhardt Development. Appearing neither in support nor opposition was Gary Brown. Gosch provided an overview of the site plan in regards to the building’s footprint, noting the elimination of a previously proposed sunken courtyard at the entry in favor of an at-grade entry, in addition to the fact that the pervious area of the project as proposed is equal to or no greater than that currently proposed. He further noted the plans consistency with the adopted Regent Street-South Campus Neighborhood Plan; the project as currently proposed provides that the building does not exceed 8 stories in height. The project features 87 apartment units consisting of a mix of 1-4 bedroom units with a final mix to be determined at a later time. Gosch detailed perspective renderings of the building and discussion with the Commission on the project. Brown spoke to the site’s inclusion within the University Master Plan area, which supports development of an academic facility on the site based on the University’s long-term needs. He further noted the University is not to acquire the site and expand into the area in the long-term. In response to issues raised relevant to the site’s proximity to the University Biofuel Plant, Brown noted he did not believe there would be conflicts with its development for residential purposes.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Provide details on the parking level versus the grade at entrance to the building. Gosch noted that specific elevational details would be developed.
- The parking should be provided at one bike stall per bedroom. The applicant with an emphasis on stackable bike parking.
- Like graphic presentation but need to see sample with color of precast consistent with proposal as well as examples of existing buildings.
- Consideration should include all colors and materials including all floor plans, each provide some details relevant to the specific design of all four building elevations including proposed material and color palette beyond the concepts displayed within the perspective renderings.

- Perspective renderings and proposed elevations should provide for consistent delineation and identification of the project as proposed.
- In response to question of garbage storage, Gosch noted its inclusion at the parking level where details were requested to be provided.
- The fascia treatment on the building looks a little heavy.
- Suggest transparency on balcony surround to some degree.
- Concern with the wash of color with precast over time. Look at the use of metal panel as an alternative.
- Show what happens on stair exiting the patio, including landscape plan details. Provide a landscape plan.
- Look at guest bike parking at 8-10 stalls including guest scooter parking.
- Next time provide information on the setback and its detailing at the fourth floor and how it is treated. For example, a green roof, a reflective roof, provisions for delayed discharge, provide details on upper roof deck accessible for tenants.

ACTION:

On a motion by Smith, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The project was referred with the applicant instructed to provide floor plans and confirmation of building materials and colors, with details supported with required building elevations and renderings, along with providing a landscape plan. The lack of details resulted in the referral and prevented the Commission from making an informed decision on the project. It was further noted that the project was moving in the right direction but required more attention to detail such as the need to see details on roof treatments, and address the concern with the potential for fading of color concrete. It was further noted to provide the requirements associated with initial approval of the project within the application packet with further consideration.

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, 6, 6, 6.5 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1208, 1212, 1214 Spring Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.5
	5	6	-	-	-	5	6	5
	8	8	-	6	-	6	10	8
	6	7	4	-	-	5	6	6

General Comments:

- Great start. Crisp, skilled design.
- Good start, interesting infill.
- Excellent start. Need more detail for initial.
- Architecture is 3D, not 2D. Building setbacks are welcome. We need more detail on floor plans, materials, etc.