



Agenda Item #: 6

Project Title: 112 S Hancock Street - Planned Development (PD). 6th Ald. Dist.

Legistar File ID #: 78519

Members Present: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Jessica Klehr, Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Shane Bernau, Amanda Arnold, Marsha Rummel, and Rafeeq Asad

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of June 28, 2023, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a Planned Development (PD) located at 112 S Hancock Street. Registered and speaking in support was Douglas Pahl. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Jason Tham.

The Secretary noted that the Planned Development (PD) is proposed in order to renovate and increase the number of units. The minimum lot width is 40-feet, this is at 39.05. Staff is contemplating a code change that would negate the need for a PD and would change the lot width requirements in some of our downtown, higher density areas.

Pahl explained that the rezone is the only pathway to increase the unit count from 3-5, until the code change would take place, although there is no timeline for that. They are on a timeline for the insurance company, as the house was subject to a fire that caused a lot of damaged and rendered the building non-occupiable. The Landmarks Commission has given a Certificate of Appropriateness, there isn't a lot of flexibility in the design since it has to keep the historic character intact. It is a tight site, there is not a lot of room to do anything more with regard to landscaping. All the units will get upgraded kitchens and bathrooms. They are restoring the balcony guardrails to the original design, and where there was a hip roof they are going with a gable roof for more headroom at the back of the unit. Two large dormers connect the two, which was approved by the Landmarks Commission because you can't see it from the public right-of-way more than a tiny glimpse. Outdoor balcony space is included in all of the units.

- Are you planning the same colors, any chance you'd reconsider the palette?
 - We just showed them as they were for the sake of convenience. We were waiting to see some of the conditions of the siding under the vinyl siding that's there now. The color is something we do have leeway to change.
- As I look up and down Hancock Street, it's a collection of pretty eclectic buildings, but not with covered third floor balconies. I am willing to bet that is not original to the building and would recommend that the roof of that be taken off, it really stands out and is inconsistent with other buildings of its era.
 - It's shown in that condition in pictures from the Historical Society from the 1960s or 70s.
- When was this building built?
 - 1923 or something like that.
- Then I seriously doubt that's original to that time.
- (Secretary) The Landmarks Commission has approved the design; the Historic Preservation Planner did mention the only historic porch was the first floor porch. The others were added significantly later, around the 1960s and 1970s. That's if the applicant is amenable and Heather is amenable, I can entertain the conversation of removing the roof on the third floor.

- The cover over the balcony is a nice addition for the people living on that floor. It was approved by the Landmarks Commission and is consistent with photos we've seen from the Historical Society, so we left it in the design.
- With a PD we need to make a finding it is harmonious and consistent with its surrounding context.
- (Secretary) Yes, that is correct. I can connect with Heather Bailey to see if any changes would need administrative approval or return to the Commission, but that would be her purview.
- The first time I saw the image of the top floor it felt wrong to me also, I share your observation. I hear it was in photographic record but that was 40 years ago, not original. I lean towards taking it off, I don't really think it fits the building. I appreciate the crazy efforts this application has to go through for a few inches. I look forward to sponsoring the code change.
- This has to go to Plan Commission right? We're not the final say.
- (Secretary) Yes, ultimately UDC is advisory and making a recommendation to the Plan Commission. Ultimately it goes to the Common Council.

Discussion by the Commission:

- The bay windows facing east, I would highly encourage avoiding any cabinets in front of those. Even pulling the island away, it's going to make those hard to maintain and will look odd through the window. Get a little more creative with your kitchen layout to avoid those kinds of conditions would be great.

Action

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.