## AGENDA # <u>4</u>

REPORT	OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: December 5, 2007			
TITLE:	430 West Dayton Street – Demolition of a	REFERRED:			
	House, Conversion of a Basement Into a Dwelling Unit in an Existing Three-Unit	REREFERRED:			
	Building and the Construction of a New Three-Story House on the Rear of the Same Lot, PUD(GDP-SIP). 4 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (07292)	REPORTED BACK:			
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary		ADOPTED:	POF:		
DATED: December 5, 2007		ID NUMBER:			

City of Madison, Wisconsin

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Chair; Bruce Woods, Richard Wagner, Bonnie Cosgrove, Marsha Rummel, John Harrington and Richard Slayton.

## **SUMMARY**:

At its meeting of December 5, 2007, the Urban Design Commission GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 430 West Dayton Street. Appearing on behalf of the project Brandon Cook, and Robert Holloway, representing the Capital Neighborhood Association. Prior to the presentation staff and Cook noted changes to the project as currently proposed as a departure from the version reviewed by the Commission on August 22, 2007. The previous version provided for development in two phases, with Phase One providing for an addition to the rear of the existing 3-unit, 3-level building at the site incorporating an attached garage at the lower level and additional living space on the second and third floor stories and the creation of a basement 3-bedroom unit. Future Phase Two of the project involved the demolition of an existing two-story house at the rear of the property to be paved for additional parking, in addition to the addition at the rear of the existing structure. The current proposal provides for the creation of the basement unit within the front 3-story, 3-unit building as part of Phase One, with Phase Two providing for the demolition of the existing 2-story single-family structure to the rear with a proposed three-story "carriage house" with parking on the ground floor level and a residential unit on the second and third stories. The carriage house plan consists of only a site plan showing a proposed building footprint in relationship to adjoining lot lines. The development of a basement unit within the existing structure as part of a Phase One combined with the future development of the proposed carriage house as Phase Two constitutes the PUD-GDP component of the rezoning on the property with consideration of approval of the creation of the basement unit as Phase One as a PUD-SIP. Following a review of the plans staff noted a problem with the structure of the modified proposal not being consistent with the ordinance for the redevelopment of the site as originally introduced, which did not reflect separate provisions of the project as currently proposed. Ald. Verveer appeared and spoke in favor of the proposed project, noting support of the neighborhood association and provisions for owner-occupancy within the proposed basement unit. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

• The previous review of the project requested that the applicant examine the development of a true "carriage house" structure that would provide for the development dwelling units on the upper level and

enclosed parking on the lower level such as found in various areas around the Williamson Street corridor. The submittal and presentation were absent of any building plans and details on the proposed carriage house, outside of a site plan which lacked sufficient details on parking, access, landscaping and other elements.

- Specific details on the number of stories, the appearance, style and overall architecture of the building to be developed as part of Phase Two need to be provided.
- The future Phase Two building has location issues relevant to the adjoining lot line; construction and firewall issues with considerations for zero lot line development requested as an alternative.
- Relevant to the exterior of the existing 3-story, 3-unit building the issue was restated relevant to the relationship of the upper 3<sup>rd</sup> story balcony with the lower two balcony structures and the need to provide for a more consistent design to eliminate the support poles for the third floor balcony that obstructed the lower level balconies as extended down to the ground level.
- The coloration of the building, yellow and green was also questioned.
- The Commission generally felt uncomfortable with approving a PUD-GDP for future phase two without a more detailed proposal on the appearance, size and architecture of the proposed structure, as well as its relationship to adjoining properties.
- The development of a basement unit as part of the phase one approval was generally supported.

The Commission requested staff advice a motion that would allow for approval of the creation of a basement unit with an SIP level of approval and still resolve the issues with consideration of the Phase Two carriage house as part of the overall PUD-GDP due to the lack of sufficient details and plans.

## ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Woods, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0). The motion required address of the above stated concerns upon final review of the project, and the following:

- Revise balconies and porches on front to look like more traditional with front end posts that come down the sides of the upper third floor level balcony and don't obstruct the front view of the lower two tiers of balconies and porches.
- Provide more detailed plans for the carriage house design, including specific plans, site design and footprint information and proposed landscaping to include consideration of zero lot line, architecture and details of the proposed three-story structure with more extensive landscaping and plantings, especially within the interior of the property.

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 1, 4.5, 5, 5.5 and 6.

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	4	5	4	-	-	-	5	4.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	1	1	0	-	-	-	-	1
	5	5	-	-	-	-	5	5
	5	5	4	-	_	5	6	5

## URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 430 West Dayton Street

General Comments:

- This is a fine start, but we need many more details the next time we see it.
- Good idea, but needs more details and resolution.