

## AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** August 5, 2009

TITLE: 115 & 117 South Bassett Street –      **REFERRED:**  
PUD(GDP-SIP) for the Conversion of a      **REREFERRED:**  
Single-Family Home into a Three-Unit and      **REPORTED BACK:**  
a Three-Unit into a Four-Unit Building,  
Plus a New Five-Unit House. 4<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist.  
(14911)

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary      **ADOPTED:**      **POF:**

DATED: August 5, 2009      **ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Richard Wagner, John Harrington, Marsha Rummel, Dawn Weber, Richard Slayton, Todd Barnett, Jay Ferm, Ron Luskin and Mark Smith.

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 5, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 115 and 117 South Bassett Street. Speaking on behalf of the project was Brandon Cook. As an introduction to the item staff noted that the applicant had satisfied a requirement to meet with staff to discuss outstanding issues with the project as required as a condition for further consideration of the project. Cook provided a review of the revised plans against previously stated comments from the reviews of June 17 and July 1, 2009. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Issue with the height of the Phase 1 buildings with new foundations as they relate to adjacent structures.
- Issue with varying types of shingles to fish scale versus wavy; fish scale more appropriate.
- As previously requested would be helpful to have architect on hand to deal with design issues.
- Need to keep properties in better condition and clean up trash and broken glass.
- The application as revised is a big step forward, some improvement with the design of the building at 115 South Bassett Street but gabled dormer proportions a little flat, a little wide, make dormers narrow and increase pitch.
- Plans still missing a lot on graphics such as materials, colors and address references. On the 117 building rooflines on top don't work, not there yet, not resolved, may need to look at roof framing alternatives that allow for appropriate head height beyond conventional trusses.
- Parking arrangement off of driveway entry doesn't work, problem with cars hitting carriage house while maneuvering in, lack of back up space and turning radii.
- The rear building not a carriage house, no garages beneath. The building at front too high, out of proportion, the gable looks tacked on, looks silly. Building is too dense at front and rear.
- Need a superior level of design, project just doesn't address design issues, drawings not appropriately detailed.
- My opinion is to reject, keep front buildings as is, not pumped up and provide carriage house improvements as represented.

- Building needs to be developed to meet the bar of the Commission as a PUD, needs to have an architect in attendance to communicate and get beyond known design issues.
- Look at the scale of materials such as the wide board siding out of proportion with contemporary architecture buildings in the area.
- Architectural changes (dormers) not integrated with the body of the original structures.
- Circle top windows on the rear house don't do much to work with building architecture and improvements to the front buildings.
- The carriage house should be truly a carriage house and needs more than one entry.
- The site has no greenspace, leave front buildings alone and create a compatible structure to the rear along with keeping existing scale of the streetscape.
- A coach house keeps parking at grade with residential units above.
- Density needs to be accommodated with parking and greenspace. The project as designed too much on the site.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Luskin, seconded by Ferm, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (9-1) with Rummel voting no. The motion reiterated the Commission's concern with the lack of appropriately detailed drawings, architecture, as well as consistency in design elements proposed with the plans, noting to the applicant to coordinate plan development with an architect to address the Commission's previously stated concerns with the review of the project.

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 1, 1, 1, 3, 4, 4, 4.5 and 5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 115 & 117 South Bassett Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	5	4.5	5	-	-	-	5	4.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
	4	5	-	-	-	4	5	4
	2	1	5	-	-	1	-	1
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	4	4	?	-	-	-	-	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5

General Comments:

- Improved, 115 is an acceptable design; 117 is still unresolved. I appreciate the effort but much is still needed.
- Please start over and don't ruin the existing building.
- Applicant is wasting Commission's time by repeatedly submitting completely inadequate drawings. Lack of site plan and distorted renderings make it impossible to give due consideration to this proposal. Applicant is asking Commission to serve as his design team, which is not our job.
- Not approvable as presented. Start over. Fix up existing houses, don't add on, construct new in back. Bring architect or we'll never make progress. Critically bad. BAD.
- Need to bring in outside professionals to help bring your ideas to a level of acceptance.
- Look at overall concept.