

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: February 1, 2012
TITLE: 202 & 206 North Brooks Street – PUD(GDP-SIP), Five-Story Residential Building with Fourteen Units. 8 th Ald. Dist. (24171)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: February 1, 2012	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Melissa Huggins, John Harrington and Henry Lufler.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 1, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 202 and 206 North Brooks Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Joseph Lee, representing JD McCormick Companies. Appearing in opposition was Gary Brown, representing the UW-Madison. Lee presented renderings with changes requested by the Commission at their previous review of the project. Changes include the corner element on the building and treatment of materials, studies with metal panel patterns, with the developer preferring their original proposal. The patio space of unit 101 has received more separation between the public sidewalk and private space with the installation of two steps and swinging doors will be installed. A more detailed landscape plan was submitted and a more substantial material sample board was presented. Gary Brown spoke in opposition. This project is within the Campus Development Plan and has been shown in the 1995 and 2004 campus plans. It is also shown as academic research in the Regent Street Neighborhood Plan approved in 1998. The UW is in opposition due to the land use issue that they would like the Plan Commission to address. Staff referenced the project’s inconsistency with the Regent Street Campus Neighborhood Plan, which supports use of the property for “Academic/Research”, in addition to its designation as “Campus,” a Special District in the Comprehensive Plan. Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Barnett read a letter from McCormick which read, in part, that the University had a 10 year option to purchase this property and that lapsed in 2006. In talks with the University 10 years ago and this past summer it was determined that due to lack of funding the purchase could not be made; this site is not in the University’s five year plan.
 - It’s a 6 year capital plan that we approve every 2 years as part of the state budget and the education building is not in the 6 year plan. There are varying priorities going on in the School of Education. They have mentioned in the past doing fundraising.
- The point that this is a Plan Commission decision is valid.

ACTION:

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by O'Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item to allow the project to proceed with the Plan Commission in order to render the land use base decision on the project's inconsistency with the Regent Street Campus Neighborhood Plan and Comprehensive Plan prior to final consideration. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1) with Rummel abstaining.

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, 6 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 202 & 206 North Brooks Street

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

General Comments:

- Attractive student housing.
- Nicely done.
- Please work with the University.

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: January 4, 2012	
TITLE: 202 & 206 North Brooks Street – PUD(GDP-SIP), Five-Story Residential Building with Fourteen Units. 8 th Ald. Dist. (24171)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: January 4, 2012	ID NUMBER:	

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett and Melissa Huggins.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 4, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 202 and 206 North Brooks Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Joseph Lee, representing JD McCormick Companies; and Ryan Kolar. Lee presented changes to the 5-story building. The lower level contains underground bicycle and moped parking and mechanical storage. Brick and metal panels will be used as the primary materials on the building’s façade with the residential entry is along Brooks Street.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Have you looked at the existing housing and whether they can be relocated and reused?
 - They are in pretty sad condition. They are in disrepair and the chances of moving them are slim to none; they also do not have any landmark value.
- At some point you need Plan Commission approval for demolition and you have to prove that those buildings are not feasible. The ones we can save we should really try.
- What are the problems, listing walls, water in the basement?
 - Water problems in the roof and basement, seepage of the wood structure with sagging floors, wood cladding that’s in disrepair.
 - No automobile parking?
 - Not other than on-street parking.
- Most student projects I’ve seen have at least some automobile parking under the building.
- The cost is not feasible for the number of spaces we would achieve. These units are going to be marketed to UW students who would bike and/or walk.
- I’m struggling with the change in patterns on that corner. Maybe think about simplifying that pattern and materials.
 - Our opinion is it does read as a vertical element.
 - I like the massing and detailing. My first reaction was this was a little busy, but I like the playfulness and edginess. I like that the pieces are not the same width. The contrast on those panels is actually not enough.
 - I wonder if there is a way to treat the windows a little bit differently than the ones above so there’s a greater sense of protection enclosure.
 - I think the fiber cement materials are fine.

- With the change in pattern the canted form needs to be looked at. Some of your material differences are very subtle. That wedge should be its own material and color. I can't tell from the material board to the display which color is what.
- If you take the angled piece and make it one color, I think that will strengthen the detail you have everywhere else.
- You don't have a landscape plan. I am concerned about what happens outside the sliding glass doors to unit 101. I'd rather see a usable patio secured with a fence but it's a very usable space for the people who would have that apartment. Control access to the patio from the sidewalk.
- Is there a plan for a blue roof or a green roof?
- Is your signage going to be lit?
- You're going to need some kind of arrangement with the City to use the street, you have no drop-off or loading zone.
- When you study your materials and colors, think about how things turn the corner, so instead of being a pasted on application it can feel like an element that people can understand.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided for the following:

- Investigate the railing or patio areas, landscape plan and material samples for the fiber cement with either updated renderings or alternative materials consistent with the renderings.
- Look at the edges of the corner element (wedge shape) as one color and bring back alternatives.
- Investigate options for on-site stormwater management.
- Provide better views of all sides of the site.
- Study how materials turn the corners of each elevation.
- Prefer material colors represented in the renderings over that display on the sample board.

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 7, 7, 7, 7 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 202 & 206 North Brooks Street – PUD(GDP-SIP)

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	8.5	7	-	-	7	-	7	7
	-	7	-	-	6	-	7	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	7	7	-	-	-	7	8	7
	-	7	-	-	7	6	8	7

General Comments:

- Nicely done.



January 5, 2012

Mr. Brad Murphy
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd
Rm. LL-100, Municipal Bldg
Madison, WI 53710

RE: Proposed Private Housing Development
202-206 N. Brooks Street

Dear Brad,

Over the past several years, we here in FP&M have met with Joe McCormick who owns property at 202 N. Brooks Street (corner of N. Brooks and Dayton). Mr. McCormick has been very interested in working with his neighbor to the north to redevelop their two small parcels into high density student housing. At one point, the University had a viable purchase option on his property as part of the deal struck when the apartment development occurred at 1001 W. Dayton Street. Due to lack of land acquisition funds in 2006, that option has since lapsed.

We have consistently confirmed for Mr. McCormick that this land is within the approved campus development plan boundary for the university and is suggested for future expansion of the School of Education's Teacher Education and Educational Sciences facilities that currently exist on this block. It is also shown for this type of development in the most recent 2005 Campus Master Plan. The School of Education has begun discussing its future options for expansion and is beginning a review of funding scenarios for development. The city approved Regent Street South Campus Neighborhood Plan supports this block as future development for the campus and as such shows "academic/research", not residential housing, as the recommended development option. Thereby the proposed development would be inconsistent with at least two master plans.

It is our understanding that Mr. McCormick and his design team have presented plans to the city's Urban Design Commission as recently as January 4, 2012 for his proposed development. We respectfully request that city staff and the Plan Commission reject any such proposal for student housing development on this site based on it being inconsistent with city approved plans.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Gary A. Brown, FASLA
Director, Campus Planning & Landscape Architecture

Xc: Alder Scott Resnick
Doug Rose, UW Space Management

Facilities Planning & Management

9th Floor WARF Building 610 Walnut Street Madison, Wisconsin 53726-2397
(608) 263-3000 FAX (608) 265-3139 TTY (608) 265-5147

From: Rick Mcky [mailto:rmcky@starkhomes.com]
Sent: Monday, February 13, 2012 8:00 PM
To: Parks, Timothy
Subject: Mcky-202-206 North Brooks

Tim the 5 story 14 unit apartment building proposed at 202-206 North Brooks seems to be to dense for the site. I own the building accross the street at 1001 West Dayton street. I have one to one parking and are only four stories tall (my building was built in 2000). How many parking stalls does this project have and I believe this project should only be 4 stories tall. Are you the planner on this project. Does this project have staffs support.

If you could answer these questions that would be greatly appreciated. Thanks

Rick Mcky



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Draft JOINT SOUTHEAST CAMPUS AREA COMMITTEE

Monday, January 30, 2012

6:00 PM

210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
Rm 108 (City County Building)

I CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Called to order at 6:05 p.m

Present: 12 -

Michael E. Verveer; Scott J. Resnick; Mary Berryman Agard; Sandra J. Torkildson; Laura J. Gutknecht; Bradley A. Cantrell; Aaron S. P. Crandall; Gary A. Brown; Rob Kennedy; Norma E. Saldivar; Daniel E. Umhoefer and Mike Kinderman

Absent: 2 -

Margaret Bergamini and Mark Guthier

Excused: 2 -

Sue Ellingson and Larry J. Warman

Crandall arrived at 6:50 p.m.

II APPROVAL OF November 21, 2011 MINUTES

A motion was made by Kennedy, seconded by Resnick, to Approve the Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

III PUBLIC COMMENT

None

IV DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None

V Presentation of Plans for a 5-story, 14-unit Apartment Building at 202-206 North Brooks Street (Legislative File 25021) by Joe Lee or Joe McCormick with Discussion and Comments from the Committee

Joe Lee and Joe McCormick presented a proposal to demolish two existing 3-flat buildings, combine these two properties, and rezone the 4,600 square foot site from R5 to PUD-GDP-SIP to allow for construction of a new 5-story, 14-unit student apartment building. The proposed building would have 15 units with a mix of 2, 3, and 4-bedroom units totaling 45 bedrooms (single-occupancy bedrooms). No automobile parking is proposed, but underground bicycle and scooter parking is proposed at a ratio of one total stall (bicycle or moped) per bedroom. The footprint of the building would occupy the entire site, and its exterior is a combination of brick, concrete block, and metal, with fiber cement siding on the top level, which is stepped back from the story below. They noted that the Urban Design Commission had granted initial approval for the design with minor comments, and that they would be seeking final approval for the design on February 1. The demolition and rezoning

requests would then be considered by the Plan Commission on February 20 and the Common Council on February 28.

Committee members had several initial questions specific to the proposal, which presenters addressed as follows:

- Q: What will students with cars do? A: Live in a place providing parking. This is not intended for people with cars.
- Q: Where does garbage sit? A: Dedicated refuse site inside the building off of Brooks Street
- Q: What is in the space between these properties and the Educational Sciences Building? A: University-owned parking lot.
- Q: How many students are in the current buildings? A: 16-18
- Q: Concerned about traffic issues - how will move-in/move-out work? A: Units will be furnished to minimize move-in issues, but hope to work something out with City to bag meters during move-in, so that tenants have nearby space to park while moving in boxes, etc.
- Q: Where will maintenance and delivery vehicles park? A: On the street. The only loading area provided is the trash pick-up area.

The Committee continued to discuss the proposal in light of the fact that it is planned for future development by the UW.

- Alder Resnick noted that after meeting with the developer, he supports the demolition of the existing dilapidated structures and considers the proposed building to be in line with recently approved student apartment buildings. No concerns about aesthetics and amenities proposed.
- Gary Brown noted that the University has concerns, and that the proposal is inconsistent with the adopted Regent Street South Campus Neighborhood Plan (2008) as well as the UW Campus Master Plan (2005), which recommend Academic and Research uses for this block.
- Mike Kinderman asked whether the neighborhood plan would need to be amended to allow for this rezoning, and staff responded that the plan would not necessarily need to be amended MORE
- Laura Gutknecht mentioned that she had been a member of the committee working on the Regent Street South Campus Neighborhood Plan, and did not recall the committee being very focused on this block.
- Joe McCormick noted that he purchased the property in 1999, and that the UW had a long-term option to purchase the properties until 2006, at which time the option lapsed. As property owner, he is concerned that the adopted plan essentially creates a long-term option for the University to purchase the site. Noted that the UW 5-year plan does not include the purchase of this site.
- Gary Brown explained that the UW Campus Master Plan calls for the eventual purchase and redevelopment of this property with an 8-story, 180,000 square foot addition to the Educational Sciences Building in this location, preserving some greenspace adjacent to it. The School of Education is very interested, looking at funding opportunities, but this is not in the 6-year plan. They would need to purchase 3 more parcels, but have no funding from the state to purchase property until a project is ready to go. UW is in a holding pattern with this site. When they do purchase property, they are limited by statute to pay the average of 2 appraisals, rather than market rate.
- Committee members asked several questions were asked about the UW's intentions for other private properties nearby, which also lie within the boundaries of the UW Campus Master Plan.
- Mary Berryman Agard noted that the ownership issue is significant. The UW interest in these properties is speculative, and appears to have hurdles and no clear timeline. The properties were not a high priority when UW had an option to purchase, and it is difficult to discourage a property owner proposing a responsible redevelopment in the near term, especially without a timeline.
- Rob Kennedy noted that the UW has worked with surrounding neighborhoods to commit to stay within a specific campus boundary as it continues to expand (mostly through the replacement of surface parking lots with structured parking, but also through property acquisition in this area). The UW may have a more difficult time staying within this boundary in the long term, if properties such as these are privately redeveloped.
- Laura Gutknecht asked whether there was a conflict here between private and UW

housing. Kinderman noted that UW Housing believes there is a sufficient amount of student housing already.

- Sandra Torkildson asked what the expected change in assessed value would be for the proposal. Joe McCormick estimated that the proposal would add a couple million dollars of value to the tax base.
- Berryman Agard asked whether there had been any recent discussion between the UW and property owner regarding preserving an opportunity for UW redevelopment here. McCormick noted that there was a discussion in August 2011, when plans were first coming together. At that time and now, UW had no way to commit to purchasing the site. When asked about the possibility of a land swap to solve this issue, Gary Brown noted that the UW has long term plans for all property they own within the boundary, so a swap would be difficult.
- Brad Cantrell mentioned that the limitations of the UW acquisition process are surprising, since there are so many privately owned properties covered in the UW Campus Master Plan. This situation is likely to continue unless UW can purchase or find another entity able to purchase and hold sites. Brown reiterated that UW is held to the rules of the Building Commission, unless a foundation could purchase property in advance. If UW cannot purchase this type of property, they may need to reconsider the boundary, which they would rather not do. Berryman Agard asked what it would take for UW to purchase all property within the Plan Boundary. Brown noted that while no specific number was known, all assessed values would be public information.
- Norma Salvidar asked how often plans are updated. Staff noted that it varies for neighborhood plans adopted by the City, and Brown noted that the Campus Master Plan is to be updated every 10 years (next update: 2015).
- Daniel Umhoefer asked whether the UW could still build the addition to Ed. Sciences building if this proposal were to move forward. Brown said yes, but they would not be able to reserve any greenspace on the block, and stormwater management may be difficult. Joe Lee noted that the proposed building anticipated that UW would eventually construct a building right up to the North and West walls of the building, so there are no windows on these sides.
- In response to questions about stormwater management and other green building strategies, Lee noted that the UDC had recommended they look at rooftop stormwater management strategies, and that they were being considered.

Members agreed that the circumstances of this particular proposal are indicative of what the Plan Commission may need to deal with several times in the future in areas near the campus boundary. Would like to see a map of where similar conflicts lie to determine the magnitude of the issue, and may want to discuss this with the Joint West Campus Area Committee in the future.

A motion was made by Berryman Agard, second by Brad Cantrell to recommend that the Plan Commission understand the dilemma surrounding this property as an example of a much larger issue involving privately-owned property within boundaries established by the UW Campus Master Plan. JSECAC provides no recommendation either way based on the merits of the proposal, but views this decision as a precedent for other similar proposals in the future. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

VI Project Updates: East Campus Utilities, Charter Street Heating Plant, Chazen Addition, Music Performance Facility, Memorial Union Renovation/Addition, Alumni Park, Shoreline Improvements, Gordon Commons, and Hockey Swim.

Gary Brown and Rob Kennedy noted the following updates:

- East Campus Utilities - East Campus Mall utilities complete, but utility work along Observatory Dr. and Langdon St. will take place in 2012 and start of 2013. Observatory Dr. will be limited to westbound traffic in the summer, and Langdon St. will be limited to one-way traffic at times. Memorial Union bus stop will be lost during reconstruction of Langdon St.
- Charter Street Heating Plant - 1-2 months behind due to difficulty getting boilers transported to site. The "steam blow" to clean the pipes began today, 1/30/12. Boilers will not arrive this winter, and coal will continue to be delivered by truck until boilers arrive.

- Chazen Museum Addition - opened October 2011
- Music Performance Facility - Currently fundraising. Plan to submit PUD-GDP request to the Plan Commission this spring, and demolish storefronts along University Ave. in summer 2012 (all of which will be vacant in May).
- Memorial Union Renovation/Addition - August 2012 start on Union addition and renovation. Finalizing "mitigation process": in order to offset the negative historical impact of the theatre addition, historic displays and other items are being added to the project.
- Alumni Park - Seasonal pier being added, hopefully for summer 2013
- Shoreline Improvements - Lakeshore improvements from Lake St. to Park St. will begin in August 2012
- Gordon Commons- Scheduled for June 2012 completion. Demolition of existing Gordon Commons in late 2012, with site restoration in Summer 2013
- Hockey Arena/Swimming Offices - Fall 2012 opening of the approximately 6,000 seat stadium for Women's Hockey games, and swimming office facilities.
- South of Grainger Hall - Plan to demolish two vacant structures on Johnson Street for the temporary expansion of a 12-stall parking lot to 32-stalls. This would remain until more properties are acquired to the west for redevelopment.

VII Next Meeting

March 26, 2012, 6:00 p.m., City-County Building, Parks Conference Room 108.

VIII ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Berryman Agard, seconded by Crandall, to Adjourn at 7:40 p.m. The motion passed by voice vote/other.