

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 15, 2006
TITLE: 1610 Gilson Street – PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development. 13 th Ald. Dist. (04758)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: November 15, 2006	ID NUMBER:

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 INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1610 Gilson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Ald. Isadore Knox, Bob Bouril, Barry Lauffer and Clarence Banks. Appearing in opposition to the project was Laura Zirngible. Prior to the presentation, Bouril distributed updated revised plans in response to the previous review of the project, which featured the following:

- Eliminated the use of the second colored brick in favor of a rusticated brick, applied more extensively on the revised elevations. In addition, stucco as an upper elevational treatment has been replaced with cement board siding, along with cast stone panels with front porches added that now connect to the adjoining public walkways.
- A corner entry has been provided at the intersections of Beld and Gilson Streets, including a tower element.
- A lower pitch has been provided on projecting roofs on elements of the second floor elevations.
- A parapet element has been eliminated as a focus of the main entry of the building off of Gilson Street.

Following the presentation of the plans, Laura Zirngible spoke in opposition to the project, noting issues with neighborhood concerns regarding density, issues with the driveway connection to the adjoining alley, as well as its proximity to adjacent single-family homes. Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Previous planning initiatives are supportive of the redevelopment proposal.
- The modified plans reflect a significant change; the corner entry appreciated. The changes to architecture in the right direction; simplified.
- The development has quality design and materials, will attract quality clientele.
- The plan for screening of lights from lower level parking adjacent to the alley and single-family residences provides that the screening appears minimal; need more screening. Resolve issue with neighbors relative to the screening of light from the lower level parking access ramp with a more extensive screening along the perimeter of the alley.
- Appreciate windows on alley elevation, help with eyes on the street.

- Appreciate architectural changes, need to address signage and potential signable area issues.
- Need to provide a railing detail as well as how the face of the ramp elevation is handled. Both need more attention so as not to look like an after thought.
- The three-sided trash enclosure needs a side or door facing the alley.
- Material and color samples need to be provided for review, in addition to the lighting plan and fixture cutsheets not submitted within the application packet.
- The lighting plan has a few hot spots, resolve with lowering the wattage of bulbs.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Barrett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (9-0). The motion required the submission of required material colors and samples, the provision of railing and ramp details, including lighting and photometric plan, the provision of a more effective screen between the lower level access ramp, the adjoining alley and adjacent residences where the screen needs to be tall enough to efficiently off-set the angle of uplighting from vehicles exiting the ramp. A more defined signage package, as well as a reexamination of the façade of the east elevation relative to the expansive unarticulated façade.

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, 6, 6.5, 6.5, 7, 7 and 7.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1610 Gilson Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	7	6	5	-	6	7	6
	7	7	6	5	-	8	8	7
	6	6	5	-	-	5	6	6
	6	6	-	-	-	6	6	6
	6	8	7	-	-	6	9	7.5
	7	6	6	6	-	7	8	6.5
	6	7	6	5	-	7	6	6.5
	7	7	-	-	-	-	7	7

General Comments:

- Thanks for the exterior improvements per our requests.
- Very nice project. Materials are superior! The engaging corner entry will be a boon for the businesses as well as street life!
- Big improvement. Applicant did a great job responding to initial comments. Please address neighboring property to allow screening of headlights.
- Much improved, could become a nice neighborhood center.
- Corner entry will be, hopefully, a big success.
- Provide screening of the drive for lots from auto lights as they exit on the sloped drive. Add doors on the trash enclosure to hide dumpsters. Light hot spots.
- Much improved architecture.