

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | |
|---|--|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | PRESENTED: March 3, 2010 |
| TITLE: 430-432 West Dayton Street – PUD(SIP) – Demolish Existing Structure and Construct a 2-Unit Apartment. 4 th Ald. Dist. (16823) | REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK: |
| AUTHOR: William A. Fruhling, Acting Secretary | ADOPTED: POF: |
| DATED: March 3, 2010 | ID NUMBER: |

Members present were: Mark Smith, Dawn Weber, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington and Richard Wagner.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 3, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(SIP) located at 430-432 West Dayton Street. Matt Aro gave an overview of changes to the project. He stated that the garage now accommodates a single car, there is more bike parking, the laundry is in a separate room, the balcony issue has been addressed, the impervious surface area has been reduced and they will look at types of permeable paving material to bring back during final approval, and a small canopy has been added above the entry. He stated that the bedrooms are approximately 100 to 120 square feet.

A memo from Zoning Administrator, Matt Tucker, was distributed stating that he has determined this to be an accessory structure. Tucker stated that Zoning staff has some concerns about the quality of the living space and they will forward those to the Plan Commission.

The Commission discussed the adequacy of maneuvering space for a car exiting the garage, and Planning staff's desire for a gable roof so that it relates better to the primary structure on the lot.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion passed with the following condition:

1. Concern be passed on to the Plan Commission about whether this type of housing with small bedrooms and non-traditional arrangement of units is an appropriate type of housing that the City should be approving.

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, 6, 6 and 6.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 430-432 West Dayton Street

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|----------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Member Ratings | 6 | 7.5 | 6 | 4.5 | - | 5 | 6 | 6.5 |
| | 5 | 5 | 4 | - | - | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| | 5 | 6 | 5 | - | - | 5 | 6 | 5.5 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Concern for bedroom sizes, although outside of our purview. “Flat” roof scheme more dynamic.
- Study turning radii and space requirement of auto back-up and access around corner of main structures.
- Bedrooms are far too small – clever small scale urban infill is a good idea.

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | |
|---|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | PRESENTED: February 17, 2010 |
| TITLE: 430-432 West Dayton Street – PUD(SIP) Demolish existing structure and construct a 1-unit apartment. 4 th Ald. Dist. (16823) | REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK: |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary | ADOPTED: POF: |
| DATED: February 17, 2010 | ID NUMBER: |

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn Weber, Todd Barnett, Richard Wagner, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, Ron Luskin, Mark Smith and Jay Ferm.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 17, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(SIP) located at 430-432 West Dayton Street. Matt Aro, architect provided an overview of the proposed plans noting that the project provides for the demolition of an existing 4-unit structure at the rear of the site at 430 West Dayton Street, which accommodates a 4-unit at the lot's frontage along Dayton Street. He noted that upon demolition it was proposed to develop a 1-unit accessory structure containing five bedrooms with various areas of the building dedicated as accessory. The plans as detailed provide for two options. Option 1 provides for the creation of a 2-car garage at the first floor level combined with a laundry, mechanical room, bike storage and stairs to both the lower and upper levels. The lower level of Option 1 features two bedrooms and an areaway with bath with second level featuring three bedrooms, bath and kitchen, with a loft living room above. Option 2 features the incorporation of one of the five bedrooms at the first floor level combined with kitchen and stairs and 2-car garage, with the lower level featuring an areaway, bike storage, laundry and mechanicals. The second floor level of Option 2 provides for the remaining four bedrooms and two baths with the upper loft level still functioning as a living room. Under both options the loft level features a non-accessible roof deck (without doors). Following the presentation staff apprised the Commission of a memo from Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator regarding the interpretation of "accessory buildings" as defined under the Zoning Code in regards to the recent amendment to the PUD provisions to allow for accessory structures in the transition zone of Downtown Design Zone No. 2. Following a review of the memo, discussion by the Commission raised concerns relevant to the project as proposed as being an "accessory building" as defined within the Zoning Code, as well as non-address of issues raised within the Tucker memo relevant to the need to provide additional information relevant to the operational characteristics, needing further definition and clarification in the zoning text as part of the project, including language that identified the parking, bicycle parking, laundry facilities that will be accessory to the principal residential building on the site being required. Following a response by Aro that information had not been provided for further review, several Commission members noted that the memo raises issues with making a finding that the project as proposed satisfied the criteria of the Zoning Code defining accessory buildings; the memo raised questions rather than confirmed the accessory nature of the project. The Commission instructed staff to attempt to find Matt Tucker (if available) to appear and address the issues before any continued discussion on the item with consideration tabled on a motion by Barnett seconded by Luskin. Upon staff's return staff reported Tucker's unavailability, in addition to an issue with the parallel

requirement for a complete application for Plan Commission review as currently not satisfied. Continued discussion by the Commission noted the following:

- Concern with the nature of the block in context with mid-block open space created by adjacent zero lot line buildings.
- Prefer previous roof version of the building and question the appropriateness of the gabled alternative as currently proposed.
- Concern with the lack of maneuvering space between the existing and proposed buildings.
- Bike parking next to the laundry needs to be rethought.
- Relook at how to get bikes in and out as well as need to look at the whole picture on bike parking on the entire site, including the existing four-unit structure on Dayton Street.
- Bike parking needs to be provided at one stall per bedroom with 19 total stalls provided, including accommodations for moped parking.
- Look at replacing one of the interior garage stalls used for bike and moped parking for the total site which would eliminate the most difficult stall to access based on the minimum amount of space between both buildings.
- A nice job of packing in a lot on the plan but way too much.
- Question the need for two car garage, can building be accessory without the parking?
- Project should provide consideration for the use of porous pavement.
- If the parking is not necessary space could be used for an alternative use, for instance, basketball or other types of activities.
- Can't support the concept. The units on the lower level are coarse and incongruous.
- The building is a good use in this part of the City but the floor arrangement and use needs to be looked at.
- The accessory use of levels needs to be explored with City staff (Zoning).
- Question the architecture of the upper deck; needs to be blended into the overall architecture.
- The lower façade of the building not consistent with upper façade, need to work out and look at details.
- Concern with lack of greenspace and look at the amount of impervious surface.
- The bedrooms on lower level are disjointed.
- Look at reducing to a 1-car garage to guarantee more accessory use on the first floor level.
- The occupant door needs more attention versus the amount of attention to the garage door.
- The architecture quirky and whimsy but basement bedroom awful small, get rid of areaway to create more amenity for people in this building.
- Need to see some real open space such as usable decks.
- Need more bike and moped parking for project to target student occupants.
- Want to see permeable pavement and more green open space, as well as a reduction in stalls within the first floor garage.
- The landscape plan is weak.
- Need stronger wayfinding to front door as part of the design.
- Go to a 1-car garage, design for a compact depth of 20-feet to give room to a shorter form garage to allow for the enhancement of the pedestrian entry feature to the building and to make more inviting.
- Want smaller vehicle accommodation within the garage with additional areas dedicated for bike and moped parking to be counted as accessory, as well as provide context as to the amount of square footage provided for accessory use.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Smith, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-2-1) with Slayton and Weber voting no, and Luskin abstaining. A previous motion by Slayton, seconded by Weber for initial approval failed on a vote of (3-5) with Smith, Weber and Slayton voting in favor of and Barnett, Smith, Harrington, Rummel and Wagner voting no, and Luskin abstaining. The motion to refer required the following:

- Work with staff to reduce the first floor garage parking from two stalls to one stall with space utilized to provide for accessory moped and bike parking, with bike parking to be provided at a ratio of one stall per bedroom and moped parking at 5% of the total bike stalls required.
- Introduce permeable pavement between the buildings.
- Reduce proposed basement bedrooms to create more space for use by residents.
- Utilize one compact size parking stall within the garage with the remaining area to be utilized for accessory use, including moped and bike parking.

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 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 430-432 West Dayton Street

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|----------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Member Ratings | 6 | 6 | - | - | - | 4 | 7 | 6 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | - | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| | 5 | 5 | 5 | - | - | 5 | 8 | 6 |
| | 2 | 6 | 2 | - | - | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| | 5 | 5.5 | 4 | - | - | 4 | 7 | 5 |
| | 5 | 6 | 3 | 3 | - | 3 | 6 | 4 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Much preferred flat roofed contemporary “folly” type design. Monkey see, monkey do, dumb.
- Too many units in a small building that separate living room/kitchen from basement units.
- Study definition of deck space as third story. Is there a way to get outdoor space, creatively above lower mass?
- Concept good but carry through is lacking.
- Support concept of accessory dwelling units, but needs work: moped and bike stalls need to be increased.