

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

**REPORT OF:** URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** April 27, 2016

**TITLE:** 222 South Bedford Street – New  
Development of a Four-Story Apartment  
Building Containing 88 Residential Units  
with Below Grade Parking in the  
Downtown Core. 4<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (41578)

**REFERRED:**  
**REREFERRED:**  
**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Alan J. Martin, Secretary      **ADOPTED:**      **POF:**

**DATED:** April 27, 2016      **ID NUMBER:**

---

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

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 27, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of new development of a four-story apartment building containing 88 residential units with below grade parking in the UMX District located at 222 South Bedford Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Anne Morrison, Doug Hursh and Andy Laufenberg, representing ULI; Abbie Moilien, representing Ken Saiki Design; Jessica Piatt, Samantha Negrin, Peter Taglien and Ronald Luskin. Registered and speaking in opposition was Peter Ostlind. Hursh highlighted changes to the plans in address of the Commission’s previous comments.

Ron Luskin spoke in support of the project, noting concern for the elimination of some trees. He encouraged the Commission to think towards the future as it sees projects that eliminate long-standing trees. He further encouraged more setbacks to allow for more street activation.

Peter Ostlind spoke in opposition. He remarked that the applicant did not share updated materials with the steering committee. His biggest concern is “what is actually improving?” Documents show four possible setbacks for this project, so what is being approved? The amount of bicycle parking provided is not adequate, further complicated by the addition of small car parking stalls.

Peter Taglien spoke in support of ULI and their improvements to the neighborhood.

Samantha Negrin spoke in support, with a couple of concerns. It’s hard to tell if this development will activate the street. Safety is also of concern where you enter the parking garage.

Jessica Piatt spoke in support, noting the quality work of ULI in the neighborhood. She noted that as a neighborhood resident, she may not even notice the slight difference in measurements along the sidewalk. From the perspective of somebody who walks by every day, it has a lot more to do with the landscaping, overall design elements, quality of materials, etc. than it does the actual setback.

Kevin Firchow of the Planning Division addressed the staff report and the changes to plans involving setbacks and building measurements. When City Engineering reviewed this project, they found the property line that was shown on the original submittal was not accurate, so some of the reduction of the setback isn't a function of the setback actually changing, but upon further review of where the actual property line is located. Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator remarked that this project will need to comply with the bicycle parking requirements as stated in the ordinance. He further noted that his committee is talking about relooking at the bicycle parking standards for the City.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Has an arborist reviewed the trees to be removed? The building is setback substantially, it's really the footing for the balconies that is within 6-feet of the sidewalk.
- Staff has met with City Forestry, the applicant and members of the steering committee; the recommendation comes from City Forestry. Where they would have to trim them back to, they would essentially be taking off one entire side of the tree.
- That's an issue with having an inappropriate setback. We're losing trees like this all over the City because of setbacks.
- While those plantings look nice, the 2-foot beds along the sidewalk will not survive. You're cramming too much onto the site.
- There is a placemaking opportunity along such a long building; is there a design guideline?
- The first floor is so close to the sidewalk, the intimacy within the unit is lost. It feels commercial, not residential. Bring the scale down.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by O'Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with Carter, O'Kroley, Goodhart, Braun-Oddo, DeChant and Rosenblum voting yes; Harrington and Slayton voting no. The motion provided for the following:

- The minimum required amount of bicycle parking will be provided.
- Study taking the scale down to allow for more privacy on the ground floor.
- Look at the terrace being landscaped to make the 2-foot greenspace feel wider.