

AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: August 12, 2015
TITLE: 115-117 South Bassett Street – Major Amendment to an Approved PD(SIP) for Roofing Material Change, Relocation of Landscaping and Construction of a New Apartment Building with Four Dwelling Units. 4 th Ald. Dist. (39094)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: August 12, 2015	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant, John Harrington, Cliff Goodhart, Richard Slayton and Lois Braun-Oddo.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 12, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED CONSIDERATION** of a major amendment to a PD(SIP) located at 115-117 South Bassett Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Brandon Cook and Matt Aro. This is a deep, mid-block lot that is currently a gravel parking lot. The intent is to create a unique development of 3-stories with a roof deck. The palette is more contemporary and richer in color. A lower level apartment is proposed with window wells.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The cover letter talks about an increase in desirability to attract professional residents. I look at these floor plans and I don’t see that. I see the professional residents you’re trying to attract and the other projects going on downtown with lots of amenities, and here I see four bedrooms and one bath? To me it seems like it’s a bunch of college kids that this is geared towards. Getting as many students in there as possible. What are the amenities that would attract professional residents to a project like this?
 - We don’t have the luxury of a large site to develop here. The amenities we’re talking about are the aesthetics of the building, the rooftop terrace, patio, close to transit.
- I’m thinking amenities like shared open space...
 - Yes we have that. Bicycle and moped parking.
- Parking is not required. I see you have a handicapped stall but I see no evidence of an accessible unit. Is it the intent that one of these is accessible?
 - The first floor is at grade.
- But it wouldn’t be a “type a” so it’s not fully wheelchair accessible.
 - Right.
- There’s a concern here about the massing.
- I don’t know that the building is oriented to take advantage of the site amenities you had mentioned earlier.

- Bike parking will sprawl into the patio area.
- Is the driveway a shared driveway between this property owner and an adjacent property or is it purely your control?
 - No we got rid of most of that impervious surface.
- How much of the drive is required for fire access? Parking is something that's not required within the block? What if you provided a drive that might be ½ as long as this one for loading and unloading uses and there is no parking on the site. Now you have the opportunity to have a commons, and for two stalls it's a lot of asphalt and you're not accommodating too many people. And one is reserved for disabled.
 - I would love that recommendation.
- I see one apartment that's for a professional – the one with access to the roof deck, it's a larger apartment. Have you looked at being more communal with access to that top space?
 - I'd say we could if we could accommodate the stair, we could look at that.
- I'd seriously look at a loading space, you wouldn't have to go that far back into the space. But all the residents monitor that.
- Then I would really suggest orienting the living rooms to be facing some open space.
- You've only got four units. You already have two sets of washers/dryers, why not just get four and put them in the units, and then you've gained another amenity space.

A motion was made by O'Kroley, seconded by Slayton, to grant initial approval, with the recommendation to reconfigure the building interior to have living spaces face the greenspace, to minimize the drive and the parking areas to create usable outdoor space, with the Plan Commission considering other issues raised in the Planning Division staff report. Kevin Firchow noted the issues the Plan Commission will be looking at, specifically findings on the design objectives listed in Subsections 28.0981 and Subsection 2. The motion noted that the Commission finds the architectural styles and building forms appropriate to the original architectural character of the block. The motion failed on a vote of (3-3) with O'Kroley, Slayton and DeChant voting yes; Goodhart, Braun-Oddo and Harrington voting no, and the Chair breaking the tie. In this case referral would be appropriate for the Commission to see revised plans, and the project will be stronger with revised plans than it would be going forward at this point.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Goodhart, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item to make necessary revisions as discussed. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-1) with O'Kroley voting no.

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
Member Ratings	5	5	4	-	-	4	-	-

General Comments:

- Lose the parking and add a common green.