

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> December 19, 2007
TITLE: 119, 123 & 125 North Butler Street and 120 & 124 North Hancock Street – PUD(GDP) for a New 38-Unit Apartment Building with the Retention of Two Existing 2-Unit Buildings. 2 <sup>nd</sup> Ald. Dist. (06302)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>POF:</b></span>
DATED: December 19, 2007	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Marsha Rummel, Richard Wagner, Richard Slayton, Jay Ferm and Todd Barnett.

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 19, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** for a new 38-unit apartment building. Appearing on behalf of the project were James McFadden, Cliff Fisher, Bert Stitt, Gary Tipler and Buck Sweeney, all representing Cliff Fisher Development; Lou Ann Volkmann, Mark Volkmann, Bezhan Surkhov, Tom Geier, Erik Minton, Ald. Brenda Konkel, District 2, Kim Elderbrook, Blake Fisher, Reese Fisher and Ilse Hecht. In addressing the Commission's previous review of the project, McFadden noted the following:

- The garage provides for 38 rental units within the new structure at 121 North Butler Street with 38 underground parking stalls.
- The two existing buildings are to be maintained on the thru-lot; off of the property's North Hancock Street frontage provide for 4 condominium units. The Hancock Street buildings will be renovated to facilitate their use and sale as condominiums.
- All parking is below grade within the new structure.
- An underlying reason for the development under a PUD zoning is to provide for development of three buildings on a single zoning lot where one residential building is normally allowed.
- The prospective renderings and various building elevations emphasize modifications to the new building's front façade (North Butler Street) which now features raised porches, multiple with three front stooped entries with an alternative accessible entry to the side or lower level.

Following the presentation, various members spoke in favor of the project referencing the following:

- A neighborhood meeting held on November 7, 2007, at the request of the Urban Design District, by the James Madison Park District of the Capital Neighborhoods, Inc. Neighborhood support at three different levels regarding the project was noted. Vote 1: Capital Neighborhoods Inc. members only – 9 in favor with 1 against; Vote 2: Any person residing in the James Madison Park District – 18 in favor with 3 against. Vote 3: All persons in attendance at the meeting – 25 in favor with 5 in opposition.

- Project provides diversity in the provision of student housing and condominiums. Issues with flawed neighborhood processes support the development proposal.
- The project provides for an accessible building with accessible parking that features limitations on options for accessible housing.
- Petition in favor of the project was circulated through the Commission noting the project's favorability signed by 129 residents within the immediate area of the project.

Following testimony, Gary Tipler spoke in favor of the project noting his perspective on building issues existing and proposed.

Following public testimony, Ald. Konkel spoke in opposition to the project noting the following:

- Concern with the scale of the project where bigger is not necessarily better.
- Porch issue is a concern. New design makes an attempt to be like rest of neighborhood.
- Concern with the precedent of a mid-block development consisting of three lots.
- What happens here will affect on-going development in adjoining areas.
- Need to protect existing houses from traffic with the utilization of bollards.
- Generally opposed to the project issue with planning, a missed opportunity to address issue in area with a planning process. Feels that a 3-story building may be more appropriate.

Following the testimony by Ald. Konkel, the Commission noted the following:

- Previously the neighborhood was not involved with the project, the neighborhood got involved.
- New design looks smaller but need a planting plan that works with the scale of the building. A line of 16 Barberry shrubs needs to be replaced with small under-story plantings with trees. The path plan impedes gathering areas.
- Provide a level area in the drive between the two houses to be maintained to facilitate vehicle access and movement before sidewalk area.
- The design featuring the inset roof at the middle is preferred.
- Appreciate work done on the project but can't get past precedents of the mid-block development.
- The accessible entry on the side of the building still needing more work.
- Next time provide roof plan with fully detailed plans. All elevations, a full grading plan.
- Reexamine the amount of space between windows compared to adjacent and existing buildings in addition to providing an opportunity to incorporate vertical pilasters.
- The landscape plan arrangement and activity areas need a better flow, something different.
- Need more work on accessible entry.
- Need more diversity in unit type and size. Units are too tight and small. Size of units doesn't lead to people staying more than a couple of years.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Ferm, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-1) with Rummel voting no. The motion for initial approval required address of the following:

- Adjustments to the landscape plan as noted.
- A provision of a driveway step platform before sidewalk where the level area is to be a minimum of 20 feet in length.

Following the motion, the Commission generally noted the project was a good attempt to fit the block with mid-block development worth considering.

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, 7 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 119, 123 & 125 North Butler Street and 120 & 124 North Hancock Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	6.5	7.5	-	-	-	-	7	7
	6	7	-	5	-	5	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	6	7	4/5	-	-	5	7	6
	7	6	-	-	-	-	8	7
	6	7	4	6	-	8	7	6.5

General Comments:

- Really, this is about the best thru-block solution that we've seen in years. The applicants have listened and made continual improvements.
- Much improved. But still concerned about precedent of 3 lot development, filling interior of lot. Units may be too small to attract long-term, non-student residents.
- Incorporate native understory trees, especially at front lawn and along south elevation. Plantings along front of building should be representative of perspective sketch (Amelanchier, Acer Pennsylvania).
- A long haul. It's come a long way.