

AGENDA # 1b.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: February 1, 2012

TITLE: 741 East Mifflin Street/754 East
Washington Avenue – PUD(GDP-SIP),
Mixed-Use Development. 2nd Ald. Dist.
(24584)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: February 1, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Melissa Huggins, John Harrington and Henry Lufler.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 1, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the project for a PUD(GDP-SIP) for a mixed-use development located at 741 East Mifflin Street/754 East Washington Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project was Christopher Gosch. Appearing in support and available to answer questions were Otto Gebhardt and Garret Q. Perry, both representing Gebhardt Development; and Dave Martin, representing Ideal Builders, Inc. Gosch stated that since their presentation last November they found their assumptions challenged in terms of the soil conditions that created a hiccup they are working through. His presentation continued with the comments as noted. We were able to salvage the tower pretty much intact, made a minor change on Mifflin Street by rotating the townhomes and instead of the interior courtyard we moved the gardens to the center of the block. We’re looking at similar materials and massing; the bulk of the project has remained the same. We have been able to work through most of the issues and we’re currently at a crossroads on a couple of things. We’re getting more comfortable with getting the materials defined. We’ve gone through the ordinance for Urban Design District No. 8 exhaustively and feel we meet all of the requirements and guidelines except for one and that’s the height. There is an MG&E easement that prevents them from meeting the setback on the Mifflin Street side. We’ve put a natural break at the entrance on Livingston Street and we’re still working through some of these ideas. This vertical element starts to break up the building as a nice way to signify where the entry is. Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- How comfortable do you feel from a massing standpoint and how this project is going to feel in an urban setting?
 - Very. We have to structurally change some things with the tower, lateral bracing internally, but in terms of the skeleton we can work that out. I’m not concerned about that.
- The plans aren’t in the packet. Can you talk about the privacy issues with the balconies.
 - We spent October and most of November making sure those adjacencies were not going to be problematic. We have at least one bedroom separating each unit.
- The building almost seems more civic than mixed-use. The scale of this looks like a grand space; it’s almost as if there is something in the scale might be too much maybe even for East Washington Avenue.

Maybe it's the way this fascia is handled. The way you've broken it up because of structural issues is good, but I think it's something that is much different (not bad).

- We have talked about this internally. The scale seen in terms of pedestrians or at the street level is going to be much different than the scale you get from East Washington Avenue or even from the Capitol.

(Maniaci) We're in a whole new area where we have an opportunity to set a new path forward.

To have that amount of visibility, to have that interplay back and forth, we're trying as hard as we can to get pedestrian activity on the street level, to have the activity and the light on the 2nd and 3rd floors.

- Very nice job.
- In the perspectives as you're coming up East Washington, the top two stories look heavier, which is actually really intriguing. The plane of that looks outward but on the floor plans I don't see that variation. When you come back let's look at that. Understanding that these will change with the introduction of the seismic element.
 - We've had a lot of internal discussions about that as well.
- The proportion of the piers on East Washington are like long fins and on the plans right now they're reading as something else. It welcomes the ability to have some of the non-Capitol facing properties to catch a glimmer of the Capitol. But on the top floors maybe there's a way for a little sliver of a window above standing height. Ways to maximize that because you've stepped the building to allow that to happen.
- Do you have the plans for the community room?
 - We're still developing that.

I couldn't find my accessible route through the elevator lobby.

We still have a lot we're working through. It will be accessible. From the second floor of parking there would be direct access to the community room without having to go back out.

As you're driving on East Washington on the parking structure, there is a loading area designated. Study the wall depths because if they are deep enough we may not even realize while driving down East Washington that that is parking.

- In terms of infrastructure elements, street lighting on Livingston, how and why is Livingston different than East Washington (in terms of infrastructure). You've got bike parking quite frequently along the streetscape and I'm thinking how that will change when this is complete.
 - We're trying to create a separation between the private and public space.

(Maniaci) When we expand the TID in this block there will be some opportunities open to the City for infrastructure improvements through those funds. Right now this neighborhood has so little proper bike parking and people have a tendency to lock their bikes to whatever is at hand. I had told them to make sure they had visible adequate bike parking. If you try to put all the bike parking in one area I'm afraid of what will happen to the landscaping then.

- What about moped parking, inside or on the street?
 - (Maniaci) No mopeds, I don't want any mopeds! In this neighborhood there's very few mopeds compared to other downtown buildings. Perhaps in the future.

Did you plan for any?

(Gosch) We have some electric car charging stations, community car and moped parking all on the first level.

- I would encourage you to use more and larger trees. I'm not convinced that the trees you've got here are going to be high enough. This could help to set up the streetscaping along East Washington Avenue.
- If you are concerned about the snow season you could go with a narrower tree.
- You have a limited number of species given the quantity of trees you show. To be a consistent look see if you can find matched trees that to a layperson look the same.

- The bike sculpture is beautiful but make sure it's functional.
- When you come back I really want to hear about how you're going to treat the soil for the trees so that they can thrive.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion provided address of the above stated concerns and the following:

- Additional detail regarding rooflines and the vertical structure.
- Provide massing details of the residential structure and additional context against the larger structure.
- Address privacy concerns with the balconies.
- Penthouse atop is two stories, looks heavy in vignette on Pages 4-7. The upper left where the penthouse has weight but looks of balance needs study based on other changes.
- Show accessible route to the Community Room.
- Study fin wall depth by loading area to be deep enough to screen view from East Washington Avenue.
- Study soffit material to deal with uplighting.
- Look at what materials crawl up from base of main structure; masonry on base?
- Provide bike parking in area near the seating wall and firm up the total number of bike parking stalls being provided.
- Look at the use of large trees and look at columnar trees along the street is concern with spacing.
- There is a limit on the number of species of trees given the quantity; look at matching trees that look the same but are different for consistency.
- Show how you plan to deal with soils.

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, 8, 8, 8 and 9.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 741 East Mifflin Street/754 East Washington Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	7	7	7	6	-	7	8	7
	8	8	8	8	-	8	10	9
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	8	7.5	8	8	-	8	8	8

General Comments:

- See Allen Centennial Gardens on campus for ornamental edible garden.
- City, integrate lighting and landscape with greater concept for the area.
- Great level of information for an initial approval – excellent.
- Very nice. A great beginning for cap east!
- Thanks for creating an iconic building!