

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** November 18, 2015

TITLE: 820 South Park Street – TSS-TRV1, Multi-Phase Affordable Housing Development in UDD No. 7. 13<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (40093)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Jay Wendt, Acting Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: November 18, 2015

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant, Sheri Carter, Lois Braun-Oddo and Michael Rosenblum.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of November 18, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a multi-phase affordable housing development in UDD No. 7 located at 820 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce and Jacob T. Klein. Registered and speaking in opposition were Jason Hagenow, Marissa Burack, Kitty Kocol and Patrick Godar. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak were Lori Hawkins and Barry Stoner. Registered in opposition and available to answer questions were Janet Stockhausen and Dorothea Salo.

Bruce presented elevations and views of the potential project. The addition of trees will strengthen the streetscape. They will be applying for WHEDA credits for the affordable housing. The applicant has sought to purchase the abutting property containing garages, but that property owner is not interested in selling. Preliminary landscape plans show hardscape terrace and landscaped planters, but more work will be going into the landscape plan as the project moves forward.

Patrick Godar spoke in opposition, noting concerns with building height, scale and density in this tight area.

Kitty Kocol spoke in opposition, having served on the neighborhood steering committee. They saw 5 iterations of this project in 10 weeks. The density on her block would increase by five times with this apartment project.

Marissa Burack spoke to issues of modern design in a neighborhood with homes from the 1930s and the scale of the building. Newer construction in the neighborhood has been keeping the height on Park Street. UDD No. 7 guidelines do not recommend taller buildings.

Jason Hagenow spoke in opposition. The building hasn’t been well thought out and is not designed to fit into this neighborhood. This is too much density for the area.

Heather Stouder of the Planning Division asked that the Commission discuss the building height, elevations, the upper story setback, materials and colors (simplification), landscaping and open space and building lighting. The project would need initial approval prior to going to the Plan Commission.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- You could resolve some of these issues if you put all your height on Park Street.
- If Phase 2 were not constructed, could you have that westerly portion of Phase 1 stepping down in height?
  - There is some transition happening. This whole area got pushed back.
- As I look at the proportions of St. Mary's, you almost have a similar piece. With that read I'm curious what you're going to use as your return material for your balconies. Would you consider looking at that kind of tenuous balcony on the fifth floor to break down the scale of that elevation?
- What goes on on the first floor?
  - It's a fairly blank façade across here. It's almost all solids.
- I was much more comfortable with the tower being stone. I'm not sure about bringing the brick up to the corner.
- I don't think this is bad building design but I think it's status quo building design. I'm just wondering if we were to give initial approval on the height and density, are you willing to push the envelope a little bit with the design? Simplification of materials, maybe splurge on that corner, because coming around that bend, that's really prominent. Maybe something really unique or special so that it becomes really creative design that is meriting the additional height you're looking for.
  - We have made some conscious decisions to get something a bit more residential.
- That's not qualifying you for the creative design to get to the extra height. You have to balance what the neighborhood wants and reaching a higher standard.
- I think it does look heavier. The staff report also says that "depending on the quality of the design, the effect of the development of the adjoining neighborhood, the contribution of the project to mixed-use and activity of the vicinity and the character of the street." There is so much concern from the neighbors, I feel like on the corner where it doesn't appear there's a need for extra height. I do feel like there are other things other than the quality of design that should influence the extra stories. I think the opposition to scale should factor in to that.
  - We have been thinking of that all along. Trying to do something on the corner that's still strong. That's why we have the sloped roof.
- The sloped roof is not strong or prominent...
  - We've been working hard at the street level to try to get that kind of scale. Pretty strong rhythm and entry features, to activate Delaplaine. I don't think the building height is the end-all in terms of scale. I think it's also what?
- Your street level is pretty good.
- What is the HVAC situation on the rooftop?
  - There will undoubtedly be some rooftop mechanicals but they'll be smaller residential size equipment pieces, they can be at the center of the roof where they'll be less visible. We plan on having HVAC walpaks in the balcony alcoves so they're all screened from view.
- The neighborhood doesn't like this, but I find in general the first design better. I think that's a more successful porch model.
- The side loaded stairs feels less social.
- The first one was more balanced along the street, the bays. Even on the lower elevation, on the upper floor where the overhang extends the entire length, versus what you see on the upper right, you had a lot

more balance and better composition. Simplification of materials and the roof plane might go a long way.

- The two larger angled bays are much more effective than the small one.
- The shared balcony/porch would read much more successful at the ground level.
- Have you run your numbers with a deeper setback?
- The height discussion is something the Plan Commission should also weigh in on.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by O’Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-1) with Carter voting no. The motion provided that the design advance its creative boundaries for final approval in order to achieve the additional height.