

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

**REPORT OF:** URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** June 11, 2014

**TITLE:** 304 North Third Street (formerly known as 2046/2050 East Johnson Street) – Rezoning from NMX to PD(GDP-SIP) for Occupy Madison, Inc.’s “Tiny Houses.” 12<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (32965)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** June 11, 2014

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant, Lauren Cnare, Richard Slayton\* and Cliff Goodhart.

\*Slayton recused himself on this item.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of June 11, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** for a PD(GDP-SIP) located at 304 North Third Street for “Tiny Houses.” Appearing on behalf of the project were Edward Kuharski, Brenda Konkol, Allen Barkoff, Garrett Lee, Linda Ketcham, Carol Weidel and Bruce Wallbaum, representing Occupy Madison, Inc. Appearing and speaking in opposition was Morgan Aten. Kuharski reviewed changes to the plans which include buffering the raised garden beds, a more distinct drive aisle and a stormwater management plan. The drive has been narrowed from 24-feet to 20-feet and includes three parking stalls, the greenhouse has changed location to be associated with the streetscape. New trees will be planted to help screen the residences from the surrounding neighborhood.

Morgan Aten spoke in opposition. She reiterated her earlier concern that any signage refer to “OM Build” and not “Occupy Madison,” more landscaping or buildings in the area that faces the existing houses in the neighborhood, which will also mitigate some noise concerns. They expect a lot of people to be congregating in this area during Phase 1 and they would prefer to see the kitchen area be included as part of Phase 1, to allow people a place to congregate. The hope is that this ends up looking like the surrounding properties in the neighborhood. Occupy Madison has indicated that they want to raise bees and chickens, none of which is described in the renderings. They do not object to the raising of bees as long as it is behind the fence and away from the sidewalk. However the renderings do not show any chicken coops or bee hives, and this lot is already very crowded. There is a concern that it is going to be very overcrowded and that having a clean and sanitary appearance to this lot is going to be difficult, adding a dozen dogs to the mix isn’t going to help that situation. This is a manufacturing operation with 6 garbage cans but no dumpster, which doesn’t entirely make sense. There is also the issue of flooding in this area and raising this site 6-inches makes surrounding neighbors very nervous because flooding can occur way down into Third Street affecting many houses and cars that become disabled driving through this area.

Cnare stated that she was part of the Common Council discussion of this item. The discussion of animals at this location isn't in the purview of the Urban Design Commission, however it is a legitimate question of the developer. As you think about the phasing of this, where do they go? We do have rules about that but from a site plan perspective, what are you thinking about integrating those into the property here?

- There is not much undevelopable land on this site so we were thinking the animals would be part of Phase 1 or Phase 2 as we go along. We don't really have anything defined to talk about.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Are you keeping the garbage cans in the building or in this little area?
  - The enclosure will hold 6 of the 95 gallon cans.
  - We don't produce very much waste at all. We recycle materials and even give extra wood from pallets to the campgrounds for burning.
  - We're about repurposing. Issues about cooking prior to the kitchen and living facilities being built, these units have microwaves, they have heat, there's talk about approving composting toilets, so we don't think there's going to be problem.
- There is also something to be said about building a community. If there is nowhere to gather, that parking area will become a default gathering area.
  - There is this front office space in the building so in the initial phase that won't all be retail.
  - I understand the fear that there will be milling around in the parking lot, but when people are here they are in the shop working, people are busy, they're not just hanging out. The organization isn't about just hanging out.
- I think that's fine but I don't think that's a realistic...I understand the neighbors' concerns with that. All of us want to leave our houses and hang out somewhere, we're not working 24/7, nor should anybody. Tell me where on this site one would go to enjoy a nice Wisconsin summer.
  - Here and here.
- I think that if those vegetable garden beds are 32-inches above the grade that there should be some steps associated with them so you don't have to hop up or climb or bring a ladder to get up into them and I don't see that. Would you be able to recess some steps going into them so you can walk up to them?
  - Most of them area accessible by standing and reaching in, there's a center section. That's a good suggestion.
- Because of the amount of impervious surface it's going to be hot there in front of the garage doors, and to detract from the manufacturing end of things, I would suggest shifting your entry portal to the north so that you can get at least two more trees kind of where the pavement meets right now. Just getting more trees in that area. If your pergola isn't centered on your door, if it's centered on your entry elevation that would be just as successful and then you could get a tree to the left.
- Your restrooms do not appear to be accessible.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Cnare, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-0-1) with Slayton recusing himself on this item. The motion provided that the applicant explore steps into the raised garden beds, and increase the number of trees, in combination with shifting left of the entry portal, with signage to return for formal approval.

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 rating for this project is 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 304 North Third Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	6

General Comments:

- Big improvement in landscaping.