

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: March 21, 2012

TITLE: 1323 West Dayton Street – PUD(GDP-SIP) for a Sixty-Five Unit Housing Project. 8th Ald. Dist. (25323)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

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 and Dawn O’Kroley.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 21, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1323 West Dayton Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce and James Stopples. Appearing neither in support nor opposition was Paul Ament, representing J.R. Fritz, an adjacent property owner. The Secretary remarked that he had asked Randy Bruce to address the 10-foot setback as adopted in the Regent Street Neighborhood Plan, as well as the Landmarks issue of the 3-story component adjacent to the Shire House, and address the density issues because they are not consistent with the neighborhood plan or the Comprehensive Plan. The revised plans show the 3-story piece increased to 4-stories and integrated the architecture more cohesively. Their goal is to deal with the frontage along Dayton Street and keeping the street edge, and relate to the open space created by the new Union South. The upper level and main entrance of the building have been rotated to respond to the entry point at Union South. Bruce had thought their meeting with the Landmarks Commission approved the four story elements; the Minutes reflect approval of a 3-story building. They did want the setbacks adjusted in certain areas so the four-story piece is identifiable. Huggins found this much more elegant than the 3-story proposal. The neighborhood plan requirement for a setback of 10-feet was discussed; Bruce stated that they are getting more of a front yard than what the plan calls for as the building setback increases from its closest point of 2’-6” on its westerly frontage of Dayton Street to 31’-0” at the easterly corner of the building; which in total is considerably more than a contiguous setback of ten-feet. It provides that they can relate to the setback of the fire station to the west (the station is at the property line), it allows them to get a nice fourth-story projection and allows for this rotation. The canted setback will provide 1,100 square feet of open space at the front building setback in excess of the 245 square feet that a consistent ten-foot setback would provide. Bruce addressed the density issue with the limitation of 40-60 units per acre; the Planning Division acknowledged there was a discrepancy between the number they had ascribed to high density and the rest of the plan. Looking at the densities in the area, it is consistent with the rest of the student housing they have done over the last 4-5 years. Wagner remarked that this is a great example of how the prescriptive plan (Regent Street-South Campus Neighborhood Plan) tries to avoid something bad, but that a good design can solve the problem. Rummel asked if Bruce had had a conversation with the neighbor who had

attended the last meeting; he responded that they have had discussions with Potter Lawson but does not know if there is any cooperation with the parties.

Bruce noted that the plan starts to evolve around the backside of the building there is a more grid-like architecture that will start matching the surrounding buildings. Huggins liked the way the brick hugs the twisted element and doesn't go all the way around. Barnett said his issue was not the plan form, it's the vertical termination of the brick. O'Kroley suggested leaving it in the front and making the brick element taller in the back; look on the other elevation and how that large brick mass gives the corner a "chewed" out aspect. Rummel would not want to lose the energy of this building by making it too boxy. O'Kroley commented that the metal piece on the window spacing; she encouraged studying those bays differently and possibly the way the windows are treated above the medium brick box. It could perhaps have its own personality in terms of window openings which would be more dramatic and point you towards the entry. The inconsistency with the awnings should also be studied.

ACTION:

On a motion by Lufler, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0). The motion provided for the following:

- Although a consistent ten-foot setback is not provided, the bulk requirements of the neighborhood plan are being met within the building envelope as designed which creates a greater graduated setback as the building recedes on the easterly frontage of the lot. The density issue is negated by the fact that it is comparable to other student housing developments within the area.
- When facing the building on the street, the thin brick element shall be the same height all the way to the back.
- When you look at the entry piece, the canopy should be separate from the adjacent balcony.

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 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1323 West Dayton Street

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

General Comments:

- Interesting dynamism of upper stories. Meets neighborhood plans for bulk. Density seems fine, 4-story element respects adjacent history.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** April 18, 2012

TITLE: 1323 West Dayton Street – PUD(GDP-SIP) for a Sixty-Five Unit Housing Project.
8th Ald. Dist. (25323) **REFERRED:**
REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:

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

DATED: April 18, 2012 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Henry Lufler, Acting Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Marsha Rummel, Melissa Huggins, Richard Slayton and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 18, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1323 West Dayton Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was J. Randy Bruce, representing Stoddard Arms, LLP. Bruce discussed changes to the bays with metal panel; all windows on the upper portion are different than the window pattern and masonry. It was also suggested that the stepback on the upper level balcony wrap around all sides of the building; the mass has been pulled out and is now flush with the rest of the building using the same suspended balcony structure. Other minor changes include a 1-story cast stone base being switched with a more consistent treatment all the way around the building, and the entry canopy now is much beefier and is quite distinct from the balconies. The penthouse now will use the same metal color as the rest of the building.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- It looks nice because now there are secondary areas where your eyes go.
- The penthouse color, it being contiguous seems quieter; it’s nice.
- The Secretary stated that the Commission did make findings on why they felt it was OK to create exceptions to the neighborhood plan with initial approval.
- Because your entry is skewed due to geometry, it may be more successful to have your greenspace and plantings also follow that skewed angle, or follow the same street grid where it’s not skewed.
- This grid works because it relates to what is going on and adds a certain energy here.
- From a landscape view I would keep that open; the traffic pattern is going to want that to be open. You are framing these islands with the frame of the building.
- Can that very first unit closest to the fire station, is there a benefit to that being similarly permeable?
- Make that a little bigger so it goes around the corner, this little nubbin’.

ACTION:

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by O'Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0).

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 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1323 West Dayton Street

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

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION

PRESENTED: March 12, 2012

TITLE: 1323 West Dayton Street – New development of apartment building adjacent to a landmark – Fire Station #4, 8th Ald. District. Contact: Randy Bruce, Knothe Bruce Architects (24388)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: March 12, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Gehrig, Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, David McLean, Marsha Rummel, and Robin Taylor. Michael Rosenblum was excused.

SUMMARY:

Randy Bruce, 7601 University Avenue, registering in support and wishing to speak. Mr. Bruce briefly presented the proposed project. He explained that modifications had been made since originally reviewed by the Landmarks Commission due to comments made by the Urban Design Commission (UDC) on massing and elevation. The UDC requested that the design be simplified. He explained that the materials would include a medium red brick, metal panel and stone base. He noted the four-story mass on the corner of the building that relates to the adjacent landmark building. They have simplified the design to show exterior skin changes and massing elements.

Gehrig asked if the revised design satisfies the programmatic needs. Mr. Bruce explained that the programmatic needs are met, but it would be helpful if the setback on the side could be removed. Mr. Bruce explained that the roof provides some usable outdoor space and that the lower levels sit square to the streets, but a portion of the upper level is turned to address the siting of Union South. Slattery requested clarification about the loss of the setback along the side. Mr. Bruce said that the balcony on corner is a 5 foot recess and there is a 10 foot setback extends all the way along the side of the building and length of the Fire Station. Mr. Bruce showed an alternate design without the setback for consideration. The Applicant is requesting the setback be removed.

J. Richard Fritz, 502 Owen Road, registering neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak. Mr. Fritz explained that he is working on a development proposal for the three properties behind the landmark site that is proposed to be seven stories and he wanted to understand this proposed development. He was wondering about the setbacks on the lot line and was told 10 feet in the back and 5 feet on east and south.

John Schlaefer, 1814 Kendall Avenue, registering in opposition but not wishing to speak but did explain that he felt that the proposed development overwhelms the landmark building.

Gehrig explained that the new design has changed significantly and that it does not benefit the adjacent landmark. Staff explained that the stepback is important to the successful relationship to the landmark. Slattery and McLean agreed that the stepback is critical and provides the needed breathing room to the landmark.

ACTION:

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Slattery, to advise the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds that the current iteration does not adversely affect the adjacent landmark and that the four story corner element is necessary to relate to the scale of the adjacent landmark.

Rummel suggested a friendly amendment to include the current color scheme as illustrated in the current iteration.

The motion was passed on a vote of (4:1). Gehrig voted No.

Firchow, Kevin

From: Emily Lingeman [emily.lingeman@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2012 2:12 PM
To: rbruce@knothebruce.com; Firchow, Kevin
Subject: Concerns about construction at 1323 W Dayton

To whom it may concern:

I am a concerned about the construction that is going to take place at 1323 W Dayton during the duration of the 2012-2013 school year. I will be living in the apartment building directly east of the construction and my window will be overlooking the construction. As a student, me and my roommates am very concerned about the noise disruption. In addition, I have a car that is parked in Randall Court and I have to frequently drive on Randall Court and W Dayton and I am concerned about the construction trucks clogging these streets. Both Randall Ct and W Dayton are very narrow and whenever someone parks on the street, it greatly slows down traffic.

Unfortunately, I cannot make it to the public hearings. My future landlord will be representing his residents. I'm sure these concerns will be addressed, but if you could please inform me on the intended hours of construction and where the cars/trucks for the construction will be parked. I will very much affected by this construction and I would appreciate this information.

Thank you,
Emily Lingeman

--

Emily Lingeman
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Biochemistry
Center for First-Year Experience Peer Leader
UW-Madison Circle K Vice President