## AGENDA # <u>10</u>

REPORT	OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: August 22, 2007		
TITLE:	1022 West Johnson Street – Demolish Two Houses for PUD(GDP-SIP) for a 14-Story, 165-Unit Apartment Building. 8 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (07295)	REFERRED:		
		REREFERRED:		
		<b>REPORTED BACK:</b>		
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary		ADOPTED:	POF:	
DATED: August 22, 2007		ID NUMBER:		

City of Madison, Wisconsin

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Michael Barrett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, Jay Ferm, Lou Host-Jablonski and Todd Barnett.

## **SUMMARY**:

At its meeting of August 22, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a demolition and PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1022 West Johnson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was J. Randy Bruce. The project according to Bruce provides for the development of a 14story private housing facility featuring stepbacks at the 4<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> floor levels. There are approximately 165units proposed ranging from studio to 4-bedroom apartments. The purpose of the presentation was to provide for feedback on the building's bulk, mass and height. The building will feature 125 lower level parking stalls. In response to a request by Ald. Rummel, staff noted that the area in which the project is located does not have a specific neighborhood development plan which supports the redevelopment of the combined sites for private housing. The existing Comprehensive Plan as well as land use plan generally indicates an institutional use associated with the University on this site where the applicant has noted the University's non-objection and support for the project. Staff also noted that recently revised demolition standards require more careful determination on the historic and architectural elements of the buildings to be demolished. Kitty Rankin, Historic Preservation Planner has already determined that one of the two houses to be demolished, the "Conklin House" may require this assessment as part of the overall approval process. Following a review of various massing studies for the proposed structure, the Commission noted the following:

- A big project in terms of building placement edge to Johnson Street is evolving, needs to consider moving building's upper two stories toward the street.
- Question symmetry of building asymmetric if moved toward corner, need more other prominent corner treatment.
- Not sure if proportions and building setbacks work well together; looks disjointed.
- Concern about the preservation of the Conklin House. No greenspace on entire site, filled with impervious surface.
- Overall project looks good; setback at top looks weird from Mills Street, don't see any bike parking, provide covered bike parking in entry courtyard.
- An emphasis was placed on utilizing roofs for greenspace where the upper roofline was noted as too reminiscent of the "Aberdeen."
- The penthouse is too white, it is not a transparent element, needs to be more integrated.

- The amount of impervious area is an issue, be less impervious, reduce parking for more open space and infiltration.
- The area as a whole utilizes alternative means of transportation outside of the automobile, therefore less parking should be necessary.
- How building meets the street important, how building meets the corner is an opportunity to provide a common space as an alternative to retail; creates a public presence with a change in fenestration and landscaping.
- Look at an eclectic or fresh treatment on the façade, especially the building's top.
- Proportions off horizontally and vertically (Mills Street elevation), including the use of the two tabletops. The roof treatment needs to be restudied; no Aberdeen.
- Need to pay homage to church spire such as a corner tower element as is similar to the spire with a setback to occur on other areas of the elevations.
- The ground plank provides for a very masculine building. The landscaping needs to be as masculine as the building. As an alternative use only trees with benches and hardscape with a basin below for stormwater infiltration for the use of captured water (rain gardens).
- Provide a public space; alternatives for retail at the corner such as a gathering place.
- Deal with moped parking in a realistic fashion with numbers
- In response to a request on comments as to the appropriateness of the height and mass of the building:
  - It was noted that the area was surrounded by buildings of this height, therefore right on overall height and what's around it.
  - Need to provide actual elevations in height of building, in addition use the Pres House in terms of height as an example to look at.

## ACTION:

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

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 and 6.

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

## URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1022 West Johnson Street

General Comments:

- Mass is fine, but close attention must be paid to how the building meets the street; particularly the need for active spaces in the building adjacent to the street, i.e. retail! Given the mass of the building and the fact that this area is "park deficient," there should be extensive green roofs and gardens.
- Excellent presentation. Address: historic preservation of Conklin house; corner of Johnson/Mills; first floor uses; green roof elements at stepbacks/"tabletops"/terrace solar access; impervious surfaces; context of adjacent heights.
- Full building mass to south. Symmetrical building appropriate? Corner element?
- Solid site and massing analysis. This designer has the chops to resolve the issues at the top, and the corner, and the spire. Bulk and massing and height are appropriate.