

AGENDA # 12

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 8, 2006
TITLE: 428 North Livingston Street - PUD(GDP-SIP), Demolition of a 6-Unit Residential Building to Construct a 5-Unit Condominium. 2nd Ald. Dist.	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: March 8, 2006	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Ald. Noel Radomski, Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Lisa Geer, Robert March and Michael Barrett.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 8, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) for the demolition of a 6-unit residential building to construct a 5-unit condominium located at 428 North Livingston Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Attorney Michael Christopher and Patrick McGowan. Registering in support of the project Eric Fleming, Michael Candelario, Christina Bishop and Fay R. Stephenson. Registering in opposition were Ald. Brenda Konkel, Patrick McDonnell and Sandra Ward. Registered neither in support nor opposition was Fraser Gurd. It was noted by the project architect Patrick McGowan that the plans under consideration reflected a new building of a more traditional design than was previously reviewed and granted initial approval by the Commission in February of 2001. It was noted by staff that an issue with this previous approval was that the neighborhood and Alderperson requested further communications on the development proposal prior to any further consideration at the time and due to lack of their support, the project was not commenced. The revised proposal provides for the development of a 5-unit condominium building requiring the demolition of the existing structure on the site, which is not a designated landmark but is within the Mansion Hill Historic District. Staff noted to the Commission that the previous proposal for redevelopment and demolition of the existing building on the site did not receive favorable consideration by the Landmarks Commission with the current proposal receiving similar reviews (see attached memo from Kitty Rankin, Preservation Planner). The proposed 4-story structure, including roof terrace, provides balconies for each unit's utilities, a combination of a rusticated stone base, light colored cream brick and a gray standing seam metal roof. Eric Fleming, property owner and applicant spoke in length to the deteriorated condition of the building, referencing consultant's reports and data mistakenly not provided to the Commission. The Commission expressed concern that this information was not provided for their review. Fleming noted that upon further consideration it would be supplied. Fleming also noted that the plans as submitted do not reflect adjustments to the configuration of the building to reduce its footprint based on issues with obtaining a required Zoning Board of Appeals variance to facilitate development of the proposal, in addition to a reduction in proposed structured parking on the site. Following the presentation of the plans, the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- The line weight and other elements of to the building elevations should be clarified to provide distinct details as to the proposed architecture of the building elevations.

- The building is not in the same location as existing as commented by the applicant. The building is not a bookend to the street as is the existing structure on the opposite end of the block where the building would cut off the view of the lake from intervening residences.
- Concerns were expressed about consideration of the project in absence of support by the Landmarks Commission for its demolition and pending landmark nomination of the structure.

Following testimony from adjoining neighbors in opposition to the project, several members of the Commission concurred and reiterated the Urban Design Commission's position emphasizing its placement of strong stock in neighborhood support where the project was not supported.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of the project. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-2-1) with Host-Jablonski, March, Ald. Radomski and Barnett voting aye, with Geer and Barrett voting no and Wagner abstaining. The motion required that the applicant submit revised plans that accurately reflected the reconfiguration of the building envelope based on variance issues, proposed parking levels (less parking), clarified elevational details, the provisions of the applicant's engineering reports relevant to the condition of the existing structure and a report on the status of the landmark nomination of the property.

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 2, 4 and 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 428 North Livingston Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	5
	3	6	-	-	-	4	3	4

General Comments:

- Atrocious.
- Not enough evidence as submitted to justify removal/demolition of a building with historical significance.
- The earlier building appeared less bulky, less roofy. This new mass does threaten the beautiful Red Oak that is an important feature of the neighborhood.
- Need more info on engineering report about the current house; need more info on parking design given reducing number of stalls from 12 to 9. Need more discussion about design and massing.
- Would like to see existing building refurbished.