

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: December 19, 2012

TITLE: 1033 High Street – PUD-GDP to PUD-SIP
for a Four-Story, Sixty-Two Unit
Apartment Building. 13th Ald. Dist.
(28624)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: December 19, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, John Harrington, Tom DeChant, Melissa Huggins, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 19, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** for a four-story, sixty-two unit apartment building located at 1033 High Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were J. Randy Bruce, architect; and Ald. Sue Ellingson, District 3. Registered and speaking in opposition was Steve Vanko. Registered neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak was Steven McKenzie. Bruce gave a brief history of the parcel and its previous visits to the Commission. This project is not dependant on WHEDA financing which makes it easier to move forward. The site is located across the street from the clinic currently being constructed (Ghidorzi) in UDD No. 7. Five surface parking stalls and a loading zone are provided off of High Street with one-way circulation coming in and back out. Underground parking is provided for 61 stalls, as well as two covered bicycle parking locations. The building is four-stories and drops down to three-stories in two locations. Gold colored brick with prairie stone base and fiber cement siding in greenish brown and dark grey are being proposed.

Steve Vanko spoke in opposition as a neighborhood resident. His concerns center on the run-off coming from the Ghidorzi construction site. He also distributed a petition signed by neighborhood residents in regards to the run-off. He is also concerned with the mass and the influx of people and crime. Parking is also an issue.

Steven McKenzie spoke to parking concerns. He lives three lots down from the construction site and there is nowhere to park. When both sides of the street are lined with cars only one car width is open at a time. His driveway often is parked in by cars overhanging their driveway.

Ald. Ellingson spoke to the parking. She mentioned she had spoken to the developer who agreed to the possibility of no on-street parking. She addressed the run-off issue and stated she will be following up with City staff to get more information. She sees this as an opportunity for some residents to not have cars as they are close to work and school and bus lines.

Commission comments and questions were as follows:

- Roof access is worth considering.
- The pergolas are a little tight; consider pulling them up. Think about if those are removed, what would be behind it.
- The landscaping needs to be more consistent with the building.

ACTION:

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion strongly encouraged the neighborhood to work with the Alder to petition that the on-street parking be handled so the tenants do not have access to on-street parking permits. The motion noted their concern for the parking issue and a strong stormwater management plan, as well as the need to address architectural and landscape comments.

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, 6, 6, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1033 High Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	7	4	-	-	5	7	6
	6	7	4	-	-	-	7	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	7	5	-	-	4	7	6
	7	6	6	6	-	7	8	6

General Comments:

- Planting must relate better to building style and scale.
- Parking still an issue. Landscaping needs to harmonize with building design better.
- Nice infill project.