

## AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> November 15, 2006
TITLE: 301 South Livingston Street – PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development/Thirty-Nine Apartment Units. 6 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (04485)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: November 15, 2006	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of November 15, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** for a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 301 South Livingston Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were John W. Sutton and Douglas Kozel, architects. Prior to the presentation, staff noted to the Commission that consideration by the Plan Commission of this item at its November 6, 2006 meeting required the following relative to the project:

- That in considering final approval of this project, the Urban Design Commission pay particular attention to the architectural treatment of the residential entrance.
- That approval of this project could still serve as a reaffirmation of the East Rail Corridor Plan land use recommendations for commercial uses on the western end of the corridor and residential uses on the eastern end.
- The [Marquette Neighborhood Association] committee will continue to meet with the developer's team to address issues of the project's use of the city's right of way along the bike path corridor: the landscaping plan and how it will relate to an existing prairie garden that John Coleman has tended for years with the City's approval, a proposed bike/ped path through the prairie plantings to the property, the proposed patio adjacent to the commercial frontage on Livingston, and the inclusion of bike parking. The use of the ROW is outside the PUD approval process and will require separate approvals from the Parks Division. Other issues outside of the PUD include the installation of angled parking and the reconstruction of the bike path crossing at Livingston as a 'tabletop'.
- Enhance the aesthetic relationship of the northern side of the building to the bike path as called for in the East Rail Corridor Plan: a) Consider more design elements around the door on the western end of the building, such as an overhang and more architectural elements. This door will likely be used by residents who are bike commuters as well as residents wanting to use the landscaped area for social uses. b) Consider adding windows or some other design element as way to add interest to the upper levels of eastern wall above the patio area which is rather blank.
- Increase articulation on the southern side of the building above the garage entrance. There is a lack of interplay between the materials that is used elsewhere in the project. It's 'boring'.
- Encourage the developer to incorporate green technology, including solar panels, into the design/construction of the building.

The architectural team of Sutton and Kozel updated the Commission at a recent meeting with the Marquette Neighborhood Association Committee regarding the issues detailed within the Plan Commission recommendations, emphasizing the following:

- Two exits on the bike path side of the building (the west elevation); one of which has been converted into an entry with a vision glass panel.
- The issue relevant to landscaping on the City property between the west elevation and the railroad right-of-way is still a work in progress, where coordination with the neighborhood working group on the design, including provisions for additional bike parking.
- Windows have been provided within the lower level garage door on the easterly elevation.
- A review of the landscape plan emphasized the desire to maintain the use of dwarf fleece flower within retaining area at the front of the building where it had been noted by neighbors, as well as the Commission of its aggressive nature.
- Issue with landscaping along the railroad/bikeway elevation of the building (west) was further discussed, noting that it should relate to the adjacent prairie; the revised plan emphasizes use of grasses along the foundation.
- A review of the lighting photometric plan emphasizes the use of lighting fixtures at the entries to the building on the pedestrian path, including under-canopy soffit lighting.
- An additional window had been added in an office area on the rail corridor/west elevation.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Think that entry treatment is appropriate.
- Commission questioned the provision of green technology of the project, which was noted as still under consideration. The use of a planted green roof was at issue with the balisted roof as proposed.
- In order to maintain the option for a green roof, the Commission noted to the applicant to oversize the roof trusses to allow for the future contingency of a green roof.
- Introduce a tree island next to the loading bay on the east elevation.
- Don't agree that the additional entry door on the west elevation, even with a canopy, is sufficient. The west elevation needs more windows, in addition to providing a side light to the door which should also include glass.
- Need to provide better access to the west elevation.
- Connect balconies on west elevation to the ground to provide access to the bike path.
- Big bluestem at the base of the west elevation could crowd out other plantings in the adjacent prairie because of its aggressiveness.
- The earlier phases of the project included glary walpacs. Eliminate the use of walpacs with this phase of the project.
- Disappointed with the lack of roof water treatment. Work with City to allow for roof drainage into prairie (receptor) in compliance with the Plan Commission's recommendation, in addition to looking at green technology.
- The vertical balisters in the railing shall be vertical.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by March, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (9-0). The motion required address of the above and the following:

- Provide alternatives to the use of big bluestem on the westerly elevation.
- Oversize the roof trusses to allow for green roof tray system or solar panels.
- Work with the City on connections to the bike path and access, as well as loading to add a parking lot island along the easterly elevation.
- The entry treatment along the east elevation fits the architecture.
- Provide glass in the door and a sidelight on the entry on the rail corridor western elevation.
- Provide for the use of “no glare” walpac.
- Work with City to allow for roof drainage into the prairie in compliance with the Plan Commission recommendations including provisions for green technology.
- The balusters on the railing shall be vertical.

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 4.5, 6, 6, 6, 7, 8 and 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 301 South Livingston Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	6	6	6	-	-	6	6	6
	4	5	5	5	-	4	5	4.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	7	8	8	8	-	8	9	8
	8	8	7	6	-	8	8	8
	5	6	5	-	-	5	6	6
	7	7	-	-	-	-	7.5	7

General Comments:

- Work with City to take stormwater to greenway and allow access from first floor balconies. Add sidelight to east door.
- It's OK, but for this site is should very dramatically connect to the bike path; instead it is set off limits by the lack of stoops out onto the bike path. It also lacks good stormwater management. Piping clean roof water straight to the storm sewer borders on immoral. There should be a green roof to mitigate the frequent flooding this area experiences.
- Too much building that goes for property line to property line to max square feet of building with no thought to it really working in the surrounding context. Using City land should not be an option. All access should be from private property into the building without co-opting public space.
- Good design. Will look nice from bike path.
- Nice, crisp design. Hold roof water on-site/at prairie.
- Limit the amount of big bluesten adjacent to the prairie, may be too aggressive in the quantity planned. Add parking lot island with trees in parking lot. Pursue pedestrian access easement to northwest entry.
- These are small but significant improvements. The developer is strongly encouraged to continue to work with the City and neighborhood vis-à-vis the City landscaped area.