

AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 1, 2006
TITLE: 1610 Gilson Street – PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development. 13 th Ald. Dist. (04758)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: November 1, 2006	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 1, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1610 Gilson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Bob Bouril, architect; Ed Banks and Ald. Isadore Knox. Duane Steinhauer spoke neither in support nor opposition. Mark Vosberg spoke in opposition. Bouril presented elements of the redevelopment proposal, providing substantial information as to site context. Banks elaborated on the redevelopment proposal's consistency with planning initiatives within the South Madison area. Ald. Knox spoke in favor of the project, elaborating on issues at a recent neighborhood meeting regarding the project. Ald. Knox spoke on the support for the project, as well as the importance of the redevelopment proposal within the South Madison neighborhood. Following the presentation, Duane Vosberg spoke in opposition citing issues with the exiting of cars from the lower ramp structure through the alley, resulting in light sweep across adjoining neighborhood residential properties. He further elaborated on the impact of the redevelopment proposal on adjacent single-family homes relevant to increase in traffic from the residential/business redevelopment, the lack of a setback and open space, noise issues, property management issues existing on the property as currently exists (trash and junk cars), as well as customer loitering. Duane Steinhauer provided further emphasis on the same issues with remarks on the same stated concerns at the recently held neighborhood meeting. Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- The site plan and building footprint make sense, especially with alley access.
- The issue with sound and light impacts can be handled with fence or landscape screening.
- Investigate ramp entry treatment as handled with other projects on Williamson Street.
- The corner needs to be activated; consider pulling it in; provide a landings with steps to the street at the corner.
- Relevant to architecture, great use of hard materials, brick and fiber cement but building needs simplification relevant to the roof's flat, gabled and hip elements. Reevaluate the sloped roof (shed roof) element between floors.
- Concern swapping exercise and meeting rooms to better relate to the building's street frontage.
- Like mass, scale and architecture including shed canopies.

- The drive aisles to underground parking should be utilized with any future expansion anticipated on the adjoining property to the east to lessen hardscape.
- The scale and massing appropriate to the site. Question the use of street patios and lack of connection to sidewalk, should be rethought to provide a more urban feel such as a front porch instead of a patio.
- Need to embrace corner with entry to help market the space and its usability such as providing an area for outdoor eating and use with opening up of the first floor corner tower.
- Eliminate the false storefront parapet element. Adjust floor plan so the exercise area is oriented to the street, “keeps eyes to the street” in order to attract young professionals; its better to have individual entries at the street instead of utilizing a common interior corridor for access to residential units.
- The building needs to be more urban rather than mall-like with direct entries from the street, not from a common corridor to residential units.
- The building exterior façade is too busy for its scale. The scale should be simplified, less materials and features.
- Need more articulation between residential and commercial; residential looks commercial with the commercial appearing overdone, lose the EIFS.
- In referencing other residential redevelopments, it was noted that units level to the ground are more difficult to market; where units with stoops more successful.

ACTION:

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by Barrett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with March and Woods voting no. The motion required that the project come back with address of the above stated concerns.

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, 5, 5, 5, 5, 6 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1610 Gilson Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	7	4	6	-	-	-	7	5
	5	5	-	5	-	5	5	5
	7	8	-	-	-	8	9	8
	6	5	5	-	-	5	5	5
	5	5	5	-	-	5	5	5
	5	5	5	-	-	5	5	5
	8	5	5	6	-	7	8	6

General Comments:

- Fine concept. Architecture is overdone, however. Needs simplifying.
- Right style and massing for the site – a real boost to the neighborhood.
- Nice project. Further development to engage street and corner will enhance vitality of development. Raising floor elevation to allow steps at street entrance to apartments would give a desirable townhouse feel and would provide privacy to units.
- Good start; simplify architecture; work on corner.
- This is appropriate infill; the massing is a good fit for this neighborhood. Access from alley is very appropriate. Bike parking is well-sited. Embrace the corner!! Consider stoops.