

## AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: December 2, 2009

TITLE: 1012 Fish Hatchery Road - PUD-GDP for  
a Four-Story, 62-Unit Apartment Building  
in UDD No. 7. 13th Ald. Dist. (16318)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: December 2, 2009

ID NUMBER:

**DRAFT**

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Richard Wagner, Jay Ferm, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Marsha Rummel, Dawn Weber and Ron Luskin.

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 2, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-GDP located at 1012 Fish Hatchery Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were J. Randy Bruce and Tom Sather, representing Silverstone Partners. Registered in opposition was Mike Mack. Bruce's presentation of the revised plans noted the following:

- A review of the photographs of adjacent properties to provide context for the development of the site.
- The treatment along the rear property line with adjacent residences now includes sections of wrought iron and solid fencing to be maintained at the rear lot line in combination with landscaping to provide for effective screening.
- The building elevations have been revised to reflect an updated and more contemporary/cleaner motif.
- Connections to the street corners are provided with a public seating area at the corner of Brooks and Fish Hatchery as well as a private access point and seating area within an inset along the building's Fish Hatchery Road frontage along with the development of a private seating area at the building's corner at High Street.
- A lake room has been provided on the fourth floor level to provide for views across Park Street to the lake.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Issue with the lack of safe movement of vehicles at the High Street surface parking lot and drive aisles. Continued discussion on this item noted that the plans should consider a separate entry and exit out with the two driveway entries at High Street.
- High Street parking workable but clumsy.
- The building is a nice residential space but need to maintain precast heads at windows.

Testimony from Mike Mack, in opposition, noted that the building looks like a shoe box rather see a three-story over a four-story building. If four-story run brick all the way up and tier with setbacks to get rid of shoe box look.

Continued discussion by the Commission and staff noted issues with the lack of full side and rear elevations to provide for an assessment of their interface with adjoining lower scale existing residential development as well as address a previous request to incorporate additional window openings within the community and shared areas on the building's end elevations. The incorporation of more windows into the affected areas was in response to an issue with a provision of U.D.D. No. 7 that requires "office buildings and other non-retail buildings should have at least forty (40) percent of the street wall devoted to windows." Bruce had previously made the case that an entirely residential building, architecturally couldn't meet this requirement and that its applicability was more appropriate to buildings within the core of the Park Street Urban Design District; where "office and non-retail buildings" would be anticipated as an option. Bruce noted that more glass could be provided within community and shared areas located on the end elevations of the building (see UDC Report of 11-4-09). Staff noted that these omitted details provide for the lack of address of how the building impacts on the adjacent residences as well as the requirements for Urban Design District No. 7. Staff further noted that this level of information could be requested to make a finding on the appropriateness of a PUD-GDP as found in Section 28.07(6)(g)1.c. of the Zoning Code. Further discussion noted that:

- More bike parking is needed at the corner of High at Fish Hatchery near the entry.
- Provide roof access from the community room off of Brooks Street.

#### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-2) with Luskin and Harrington voting no. The motion required that the plans be modified to provide details of both side and well as rear elevations of the building as well as the restoration of precast heads at windows. The motion was passed on the vote of (5-2) with Luskin and Harrington voting no. Luskin remarked that issues with parking circulation were a problem with Harrington noting that issues with the lack of building elevations as it relates to the maximum amount maxing out of the bulk and mass of the building prevent adequate evaluation of the project against the provisions for Urban Design District No. 7 as well as its impact on adjacent less dense residential properties and the PUD requirements.

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 4, 5, 6, 6, 6, and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1012 Fish Hatchery Road**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	4	5	5	-	-	2	5	4
	6	6	6	-	-	4	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	7	5	-	-	5	7	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	5	5	-	-	-	5	5	5

General Comments:

- Show us all sides of the building.

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 4, 2009
TITLE: 1012 Fish Hatchery Road - PUD-GDP for a Four-Story, 62-Unit Apartment Building. 13th Ald. Dist. (16318)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: November 4, 2009	ID NUMBER:

---

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn Weber, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Richard Wagner, Jay Ferm and Ron Luskin.

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 4, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a PUD-GDP located at 1012 Fish Hatchery Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce and Tom Sather, representing Silverstone Partners; and Christopher Culver.

Bruce provided an outline of the project's design elements against the requirements for UDD No. 7 as previously requested by the Commission which was developed in consultation with staff. The handout emphasized the project's consistency with both requirements and guidelines of the district. Bruce presented modified plans in response to the Commission's previous review, noting issues that required clarification of the requirements and guidelines for UDD No. 7 as follows:

- The setback above the third-story is a guideline for the project. The modified plan features setbacks at the end elevations of the building abutting Brooks and High Streets where architectural details and features provide for a distinct recognition of the upper façade of the third-story in juxtaposition with the development of the four-story element. He noted his belief that this approach would be consistent with the requirements for the UDD No. 7 in light of the property not being located within the core of the Park Street Corridor, but on Fish Hatchery Road.
- Bruce noted the requirement for office and other non-retail buildings to have at least 40 percent of the street wall devoted to windows as not possible within a residential setting based on standard architectural limitations in the building of residential units. He further provided that the placement of more glass could be provided in community and shared areas as a means to maximize the amount of glass within the building.
- Bruce further noted the need to switch the drop-off and entry from its previous proposed location on Brooks Street to High Street in order to deal more effectively existing grades on the site which allow for a side plan which worked more smoothly for defensible space on both the street side and court side elevations of the building.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Make building work more with its relationship to Brooks Street and Fish Hatchery Road.
- The setback above the third floor is not essential, the building as designed in detail provides for appropriate delineation between the third and fourth floor levels.
- Do something off the chart architecturally with the building, encourage to be more modern architecture.
- Put some type of corner entry at High Street and Fish Hatchery Road.
- Provide more details on the street-side courtyards.
- Comfortable relocation of the building's entry High and Fish Hatchery, but attempt to provide a public space at the corner of Brooks and Fish Hatchery, or at minimum, private base for residents. Note: most Urban Design Commission members not comfortable with requiring public open space at the corner, the private space was more acceptable.
- Show how landscaping ties in with adjoining properties to the west including context photos.
- Have a public entry that connects to public spaces the corners.

### **ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1012 Fish Hatchery Road

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

General Comments:

- Entry to building should be from sidewalk; architecture too traditional, predictable for this location; create public space at Brooks/Fish Hatchery.
- Good defensible space at courtyards along Park Street, consider use as entryways. Provide enlarged plans at outdoor spaces.

## AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> October 21, 2009
TITLE: 1012 Fish Hatchery Road – PUD-GDP for a Four-Story, 62-Unit Apartment Building. 13 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (16318)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: October 21, 2009	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn Weber, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Mark Smith, Richard Wagner, Ron Luskin and Jay Ferm.

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 21, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD-GDP located at 1012 Fish Hatchery Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were J. Randy Bruce, Tom Sather and Henry Gempeler, all representing Silverstone Partners. Prior to the presentation staff noted that the site is currently the surface parking lot component of the former Dean/Morningstar Dairy site located at the intersections of Fish Hatchery Road with South Park Street. The site is within the “Wingra Market Study and Conceptual Redevelopment Plan Summary Report” plan area which recommends medium density residential development on the site which was anticipated to be a component of the high-density residential or lodging first level commercial designation of the main site for the former dairy operation. Bruce then provided a review of the plans for the four-story, senior housing facility to be developed by Stonehouse Development with Attorney Gempeler noting his representation of Stonehouse as the developer. Following a review of the plans the Commission noted the following:

- The building is too suburban in design; needs to be more urban.
- Look at a drop-off in front of building along with a main building entry and porch.
- If entry stays at corner, do more architecture at corner.
- Look at different route options per the requirements of Urban Design District No. 7, in addition to looking at a usable roof terrace.
- Need to provide neighborhood context, need to address the requirements for Urban Design District No. 7 relative to its setback provisions and design criteria. Need to break up length of building.
- Minimize lawn areas to reduce maintenance.
- The relationship between the patio areas and parking needs more work.
- Eliminate belt of green around the building to create a more significant green/activity area for use by tenants and guests. Look at placing a line of trees at street to buffer and reduce noise.
- Create a lake room at the northeast corner to capture view corridor to the lake.
- The setback is appropriate given traffic on Fish Hatchery Road.
- Building needs to be more contemporary and urban.
- Utilize the proposed masonry wall between the street and building to create semi-private spaces.

- Consider recessed balconies to feel more protected and comfortable.
- Building should not be so symmetrical in order to be urban.
- Drop-off may not be appropriate on Fish Hatchery.
- Look at providing an enhanced rear activity area.
- Look at the requirements for Urban Design District No. 7 for a front entry facing the street.
- Activity entry and surface parking next to neighborhood should be moved to the north end.
- Consider raising garage entry to be more urban and screen surface parking.
- Pull building forward on Fish Hatchery Road and create a private open space at its rear.

**ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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 4, 4, 5, 5 and 6.



URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1012 Fish Hatchery Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	5	4						4
								5
	4	4	4					
								info
								4
	6	5	-	-	-	6	6.5	6
	5	5	-	-	-	6	5	5

General Comments:

- Very bland. This is an exciting location in an urban/industrial/residential corridor. Lots of opportunities to build on.
- Program fits area, conceptualization does not.
- Retail? Street entries?
- Center entry @ street.
- Suburban architecture is not appropriate.
- Review UDD #7: setbacks, front façade and front entrance should face primary street; enhance architectural interest of building face, preference for flat roofs; stepbacks at 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of 15 foot.
- Architecture seems tired, seen it before – why not a trendsetter? Should be urban! 4<sup>th</sup> floor “Lake Room” flat roofs? Say yes.
- Study “commercial” uses – office, internet café on Fish Hatchery near Park and residential on First across from houses on High. Transitional site with great potential.
- More urban character/qualities. Concentrate open space for resident use.