# AGENDA # <u>5</u>

### City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT	OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 21, 2012		
TITLE:	202 & 206 North Brooks Street – PUD(GDP-SIP), Five-Story Residential	REFERRED:		
	Building with Fourteen Units. 8 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (24171)	REREFERRED:		
		<b>REPORTED BACK:</b>		
AUTHOR	: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:	
DATED: March 21, 2012		ID NUMBER:		

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Melissa Huggins, Henry Lufler, Todd Barnett, Marsha Rummel, Richard Slayton and Dawn O'Kroley.

## **SUMMARY**:

At its meeting of March 21, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 202 and 206 North Brooks Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Joseph Lee, representing JLA Architects; and Joseph McCormick. Appearing and speaking in opposition were Gary Brown, representing UW-Madison; and Rick McKy. Lee noted that the Plan Commission determined that there were no land use issues with this project, but did ask the Urban Design Commission to reexamine the building mass, setbacks and stepbacks in regards to the provisions of the adopted Regent Street South Campus Neighborhood Plan, primarily based on the project's inconsistency with the building setback provision of tenfeet.

Gary Brown spoke about the Regent Street Campus Plan and its specific requirement about a 10-foot setback. Every street development talked about in the plan talks about a 10-foot setback except Regent Street, which is 3-feet for the commercial nodes. It also requires that developments meet the design guidelines and this language was adopted by the Common Council. The University continues to take issue with this project because it doesn't conform to the neighborhood and campus plan.

Barnett mentioned possible options to break up the mass with a less than 10-foot setback. Huggins stated she struggled with that a bit, as a planner. The overall goals established with the plan perhaps became too prescriptive. You can have a successful urban pedestrian experience with zero setbacks. Rummel mentioned that having the Urban Design Commission make comments on this project will greatly assist the Plan Commission in their determination of this project.

Ald. Scott Resnick stated that in looking at other modern student developments within the last five years, this fits into the context of the neighborhood. There are elements that do not meet with the neighborhood plan but this can still be a strong project for the district.

Rummel felt the Commission should go through all the elements before making a determination. Barnett stated that the relief of the façade works well as it relates to it being a corner lot without a setback; the fact that it's on a corner helps support the basis for the zero lot line where some of the setbacks in a horizontal mode relate to smaller scale adjacent structures and address the context (existing). Based on these factors an exception to the plan is warranted based on this site specific design.

## ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0).

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 7, 7, 7.5 and 8.

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.5
	-	7	-	-	-	-	7	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8

#### URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 202 & 206 North Brooks Street

General Comments:

- Site plan doesn't exactly conform to Regent Street Campus Plan setbacks but many strong elements. Façade variations, context of institutional neighbors.
- Get it built.