

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: June 6, 2012

TITLE: 211 South Bedford Street – PUD(GDP-SIP), 59-Unit Apartment Building. 4th Ald. Dist. (25976)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: June 6, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Dawn O’Kroley, Henry Lufner, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, Tom DeChant, Marsha Rummel and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 6, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 211 South Bedford Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were John W. Sutton and Douglas Kozel. Sutton presented plans for a 58-unit apartment building. There are currently four houses along Doty Street, the Quonset hut and one unit on Bedford Street with an interior garage and gravel parking. There is no vegetation on the site. This block was identified as a transition area for more density in both the Downtown Plan and the Bassett Neighborhood Plan. Vegetation will be added and the number of curb cuts will be reduced. Changes to the plan include a first floor workout room rather than a residential unit, and the addition of 19 parking spots in the underground garage. Kozel showed perspectives and materials including brick and hardiboard siding, steel lintels and canopies and manufactured stone. Vertical planters will add vegetation, with plant type being written into the tenants’ leases. Guest bike parking will be provided, and the developer is considering space for a community car, as well as plug-ins for electric cars. Stormwater management plans include a “first flush” by integrating storage to be used for passive irrigation. Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Good use of natural materials.
- I have concerns about the accessible route. I’m not entirely comfortable with that as proposed (thru courtyard entry). You’ve got a beautiful entry, the scale is nice; but it’s not for everyone. The main entry should be for everyone.
 - Our alternative is to design landscaped courtyards as an entry feature that provides an accessible route.
- All things considered, if you give proper orientation and design to that landscaped courtyard space it would be appropriate, but I wouldn’t ruin this entry (Bedford).
- Could the building be designed with the landscaped court as the entry feature?
- Can you come up with a ramp that doesn’t detract from the architecture?
- Is there a way to hide the ramp a bit with landscaping?

- I would prefer not to see a ramp at the corner and front entry, if it can be avoided.
- Consider texture and color for the walk to the entrance to the courtyard entry to enhance its function as an additional main entry to the building.
- You don't have any Aspens specified right now. Add them in a way that nature would have, randomly.
- Allow your plantings to invite people in.
- That second entry needs to have its own sense of presence.

ACTION:

On a motion by O'Kroley, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1-0) with Barnett voting no. The motion required that the applicants continue to study the second courtyard entry to be at grade and equitable with the Bedford Street "staired" entry, including address of comments relevant to the incorporation of "Aspen" with the planting plan.

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 6.5, 7, 7, 8 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 211 South Bedford Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating	
Member Ratings	5	7	-	-	-	5	8	6.5	
	6	8	8	-	-	3	8	7	
	7	9	6	-	-	6	8	7	
	6	8	8	-	-	5	8	8	
	7	8	6	-	-	6	8	8	

General Comments:

- Want to see more on stormwater management, visitor bike parking and review/enhance accessible entry.
- Very nice project but second-rate entry for people with special needs is not acceptable.
- Issue is equitable handicap pedestrian entrance. Building design is really outstanding.
- Make both entries equally grand. Nice project!