AGENDA # <u>11</u>

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF:	URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: July 11, 2007			
TITLE:	119, 123 & 125 North Butler Street and 120 & 124 North Hancock Street - PUD(GDP) for a 34-Unit Apartment	REFERRED: REREFERRED:			
	Building, Residential Redevelopment. 2nd Ald. Dist. (06302)	REPORTED BACK:			
AUTHOR: Al	an J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:		
DATED: July 11, 2007		ID NUMBER:			

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Lou Host-Jablonski, Richard Slayton, Todd Barnett, Michael Barrett, Joan Bachleitner, and Marsha Rummel.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 11, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REJECTED** a PUD(GDP) located at 119, 123 and 125 North Butler Street and 120 and 124 North Hancock Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was James McFadden. Appearing in opposition was Eugene S. Devitt. Appearing neither in support nor opposition were Jean Borman and Brenda Konkel. The revised plans as presented by McFadden featured the following:

- 34-unit apartment building with 38 lower level parking stalls.
- The two structures to be maintained at 120 and 124 North Hancock, now feature stairs at the rear of each of the buildings to provide access off of the shared drive between the two buildings which provides access to lower level parking within the new building at 119-125 North Butler Street.
- The new building's main entry at Butler Street is redesigned to eliminate the proposed curved masonry wall which now features a planting area.
- The front elevation of the building has been modified to feature a down-scaled central peak.

Following the presentation, Eugene Devitt, a member of the developer's steering committee for the project spoke to these issues.

- Concern relevant to the mass of the building, over 3 lots and not keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
- The developments of the disturbance of a historical intact block.
- Issues with the height and mass of the building's roof not fitting in with the rest of the neighborhood.
- The basement's extension out of the ground for housing not in character with other homes in the area.
- The overall mass of the building in consistent with the character of the original homes in the neighborhood with addition to the porch elevation not consistent with that of surrounding residential buildings.

Ald. Brenda Konkel spoke neither in opposition or support of the project but raised concerns relevant to the impact of overall footprint of the building on the block as well its' precedent for future development. She noted the building's development would introduce an element into a unique block in the neighborhood and noted concern with its effect on the block and the character of the neighborhood.

Following Ald. Konkel's comments the Commission noted the following:

- The project disrupts the rhythm and the scale of the entire block; if the Alder cannot support, figure a way to make it less overwhelming, needs to be scaled down. It should go to the Landmarks Commission for feedback.
- Consider reducing the width of the building by nine feet. Reduce scale. Previously stated concerns with the building's scale and mass were noted (see the Urban Design Commission report of May 9, 2007) by several Commissioners.

Further concerns stated by the Commission were as follows:

- Issue is with depth and what it does to the block. Although not one style of building in the neighborhood, it is out of character relative to scale and mass.
- The street elevation (Butler) great design.
- The narrow drive between two houses as a single access (North Hancock Street) problematic.
- The landscape cover over lower level parking, a no-man's land.

Discussion by the Commission and staff relative to referral of the project to allow for address of the previously stated and re-stated concerns with the design of the project as a "mid-block through development vs. rejection of the project relevant to provide a basis for the Plan Commission's discussion on the "land use issues" associated with the project followed.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Barrett, the Urban Design Commission **REJECTED** this project. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-3) with Barrett, Rummel, Slayton and Wagner voting in favor, and Barnett, Bachleitner and Host-Jablonski voting no. Those voting against the motion for rejection felt that the project should have been referred to allow for the necessary modifications based on issues raised with this consideration of the project, as well as with the Commission's previous review.

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 3, 3, 4, 5, 5, 5 and 6.

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
	4/5	5/6	45	-	-	4/5	5	5
	3	-	-	-	-	-	3	3
	3	-	2	-	-	-	3	3
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	4	8	5	-	-	4	5	5
	5	8	6	6	-	5	5	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 119, 123 & 125 North Butler Street and 120 & 124 North Hancock Street

General Comments:

- It is a fine design, but should not be built at the expense of the current rhythm and scale of the block. It will rob neighbors of sunsets and sunrises. Scale <u>is</u> important!
- Reject because it disrupts rhythm and scale of interior of block and street face is out of proportion.
- Architecture fine, scale is major issue (depth).
- Issues of size, and specifically the depth of this project into the center of the block, have not been resolved with the revised submittal. Plan Commission needs to grapple with this question, as to how we ought to deal with proposals to substantially alter historically whole blocks. Architecturally, this is well designed.