

## AGENDA # 10

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> March 21, 2007
TITLE: 1815 University Avenue – Demolition and Development of a 64-Unit Apartment Project, PUD(GDP-SIP). 5 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (05949)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>POF:</b></span>
DATED: March 21, 2007	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

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

\*Wagner abstained from deliberations on this item.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of March 21, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of demolition and development of a 64-unit apartment project located at 1815 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were John Barton, Patrick McGowan, Steve Brown, Troy Thiel, Tim Wadlington and Ald. Robbie Webber. Prior to the presentation, staff noted to the Commission several correspondences; some in support with one in opposition. The project provides for the demolition of an existing 3-½ story, 102-unit residence hall called “The Princeton House” which is currently vacant. Upon demolition it is proposed to construct a four-story 64-unit apartment building with lower level parking to be called “Brown Lofts.” Projections on the north elevation (University Avenue) feature the application of stone block veneer base at the first floor level with the use of two different colors of brick on projecting elements with recessed elements featuring combination of the use of hardiplank siding (second and third floor levels) with EIFS on the fourth floor elevation. Similar variations in material applications are provided on both the east and west elevations. The south or rear elevation of the building maintains the use of the stone veneer base with the uniform application of hardiplank siding on the second and third floor stories, along with EIFS at the fourth story level. Staff noted that the Landmarks Commission, at its meeting of March 19, 2007 recommended approval consistent with the criteria for the construction of new buildings within the University Heights Historic District. Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- It is bothersome that the building is not all brick as other multi-unit residential buildings within the area which feature great ornamentation which is missing with the false materials (hardiplank siding and EIFS).
- Don’t like going from the stone base to clapboard siding and EIFS; needs to be all brick which gives massing and sturdiness, important to be all masonry.
- Issue with how the new building will fit against the rear property line against all property lines, front sides and rear. Provide photos and details, want to see upon return for further consideration.
- Question the absence of retail commercial within the first floor level.
- Appreciate the number of meetings regarding the project with the neighborhood.

- Provide a front view showing the height of the proposed building with that of existing buildings to the east and west.
- Worried about the 12-foot floor-to-floor heights as it affects the overall height of the building; provide information on the overall height of the building in feet to compare with other buildings in the area.
- Provide a cross-section on what's happening to retaining wall treatment, including dimensions.
- Having no retail in this location a real mistake, a missed opportunity.
- Question appropriateness of balconies above the main entry; agree with the issue relevant to the use of siding and EIFS; cheapened, make brick all around.
- Lack of clarify about what's happening at the sidewalk; no plantings shown in renderings.
- Agree with the issue with lack of effective setback along Princeton Avenue, as well as University Avenue. Other buildings within area are quite a way setback. This building will stick out; need a compromise between as well as resolve the issue with the close rear setback. The setbacks are way too small for the mass of the building where other buildings within the area are smaller in mass with greater setbacks.
- Height is a concern; consider a 9-foot floor-to-floor instead of a 12-foot floor-to-floor relationship.
- Reexamine how much space is necessary to create an adequate landscaped setback 2-feet is insufficient for a planting area.
- Corrective landing and bump out details along Princeton? By reducing the façade at the corner from a two-foot set back to a five-foot setback.
- Resolve issue with no landscaping at the rear property line.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Woods, seconded by Ald. Radomski, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-2-1) with Geer and Barrett voting no and Wagner 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 5, 6, 6, 6.5 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1815 University Avenue**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating	
<b>Member Ratings</b>	7	7	6	6	-	7	8	7	
	6	7	6	-	-	6	7	6.5	
	5	7	-	-	-	-	-	6	
	5	5	3	3	-	6	6	5	
	7	5	5	-	-	6	6	6	

General Comments:

- Must have masonry all the way around loose balconies at main entry. Don't lose retail idea – this is a real opportunity. 12' floor to floor is an issue.
- The new building design is a much better fit into the neighborhood. The two interior patio courtyards are good resident open space opportunities.
- Good architecture, though needs to be all brick. Rear yard setback (the lack thereof) is a concern...though apparently the neighborhood is OK with this.
- Architectural treatment should be topnotch in a neighborhood like this. This isn't there yet. The building is practically lot-line-to-lot-line with no breathing space. The lack of retail is a major detriment.
- Setbacks are a concern. I agree that building should be all masonry. Floor-to-ceiling ratio should be decreased.
- Building is too big for site and setbacks are too small. Building needs to be all masonry – no siding or EIFS.