

**AGENDA # 4**

City of Madison, Wisconsin

**REPORT OF:** URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** May 11, 2011

**TITLE:** 1907-1911 Monroe Street – PUD(GDP-SIP) for a 4-Story Commercial/Residential Apartment Building. 13<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (21200)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

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

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** May 11, 2011

**ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, R. Richard Wagner and Henry Lufler, Jr.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 11, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP), Option Number 1 located at 1907-1911 Monroe Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was J. Randy Bruce, representing Mark and Maggie Smith. Appearing in opposition to the project and wishing to speak were Tom Turnquist and Chris Thomas. Appearing in opposition and not wishing to speak was Tara Montemaya. Appearing neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak were Matt Schultz and Jon Standridge, representing the Vilas Neighborhood Association. In addressing the Commission’s previous comments, Bruce presented details for a stamped concrete walk which will withstand constant use and make for easier maintenance. In terms of elevations, features of the architecture on the front of the building have been carried over to the sides and back; they looked at different options and felt it was most successful to take the same window pattern and take that to the back of the building as well with hardiboard siding. Building materials were presented, with champagne colored brick, a storefront color and railing color in dark bronze, corrugated metal for the upper level of the building and in an accent, with simulated prairie stone along the base.

Tom Turnquist spoke as a neighbor, stating they like the older version better because it is more in keeping with the historic elements of the neighborhood. He quoted some of the provisions of the Monroe Street Commercial District Plan, that lean toward preserving the historic qualities of the neighborhood. He noted this design is something more modern than is appropriate for the neighborhood and wants that project to be able to work in harmony with the existing architecture of this historic neighborhood.

Matt Schultz spoke as a neighborhood resident, stating they were not aware of the other design that was made available to the Commission members at previous meetings. He appreciates the historic design of the neighborhood.

Chris Thomas prefers this style over the others and feels it’s much more appropriate for the neighborhood (traditional option). The concerns of the neighborhood are not wanting to see an urban Euro-style architecture on Monroe Street. They aren’t against change, but there is a stark difference for the neighborhood residents. He feels that since the building owner, Mark Smith, could go either way with the design, that is an important

comment for the Commission to consider. They had a neighborhood meeting on May 9 with no one approving this new design.

Tara Montemaya, whose house faces the alley where residents will be entering and exiting the underground parking, spoke of her concerns with headlights, noise, traffic, and children playing. She would like to see smaller density, shorter height and fewer residents. The increased traffic in the neighborhood is already a safety issue and this project will add to that.

John Standridge spoke as the president of the Vilas Neighborhood Association. They have had a lot of chances to look at the proposals; of the 18 people in attendance, 15 voted for Option 1 (traditional), none voted for Option 2 (contemporary).

Note: The display boards before the Commission featured the contemporary modern version as Option #1 that had received initial approval previously by the Urban Design Commission with Option #2 as the traditional version favored by many area residents in attendance.

Bruce pointed out that behind the alley are a block of garages, which will help to block headlights. Barnett feels the proportions are done well, and the architecture of the neighborhood is one of variety. O’Kroley appreciated the neighborhood’s concerns and their interest in what happens with their surroundings. She pointed out that at the time these older buildings were built, they were built for the architecture and needs of the time. As time evolves, we still have to be respectful of those buildings, but in terms of scale, material and compatibility we need to build truthfully to the materials we have today, and have a dialog with those historic buildings without emulating them. Rummel sees this modern option as one where it potentially is not inviting to a retail component. She sees the difference between the two options as how the first floor is going to be used. Barnett agreed; he is bothered by the large columns from the Trader Joe’s building and sees this project as much more transparent and appropriate for the space (Option #1). Smith pointed out that Monroe Street does not have one type of architecture, it’s a mélange. Slayton said the Commission appreciates the reiterations the plans have gone through to try to accommodate the architecture of the neighborhood; he also pointed out the need to listen to the neighbors and respect their input, and understand that the Commission encourages the use of the contemporary pieces but when you have such a clear voice from the neighborhood you need to listen.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by O’Kroley, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of Option No. 1 with the larger first floor openings, detailing more appropriate to modern construction, with the form, composition and mass as appropriate to the historic neighborhood. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-2) with Lufler and Rummel voting no.

Barnett mentioned that the Commission greatly appreciates the neighborhood’s input, that the neighborhood is a collection of many types of different architecture and part of the richness of the neighborhood is from the variety of styles and materials. The proposed version is based on something well-executed and addresses the neighborhood and urban street in an appropriate manner. Rummel felt conflicted and asked for a gesture that the project doesn’t have to be exactly as presented. Bruce suggested moving forward with language suggesting that the original version is acceptable. Staff noted the Urban Design Commission is a recommending body to both the Plan Commission and Common Council on the PUD rezoning; where both bodies can evaluate both options based on input at the future hearings. Bruce when questioned by staff noted that the current version of the “traditional” option had been modified to address the Urban Design Commission’s previous comments of March 2, 2011; therefore, staff felt if that version were approved by the Plan Commission and Common Council it would reflect the Commission’s input and comments.

A previous motion by Slayton, seconded by Lufler to recommend approval of Option #2 which reflected more traditional architecture failed on a vote of (3-4) with Rummel, Lufler and Slayton voting in favor; and Barnett, Smith and O’Kroley voting no, with Wagner breaking the tie vote. During further discussions, Smith asked the Commission to think back on how many times the Commission may have dictated to an applicant or owner what style their building is going to be. Barnett replied that the Midvale Commons project was the one time the Commission asked them to look at the context of their project. Rummel would like the Commission to consider what has been brought to this point and support moving forward while incorporating the needs of the neighborhood.

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 6, 7, 7.5, 8 and 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1907-1911 Monroe Street**

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

General Comments:

- Contemporary version is much better.
- Prefer original option. Architectural designs are both just “skin,” but neighbors didn’t have a change to collaborate in the design process.
- Keep it modern – look ahead! Not backward.