

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** August 17, 2016

TITLE: 223 & 219 West Gilman Street –
Demolition and Addition to “Chabad
House” in the Downtown Core District. 4th
Ald. Dist. (41975) **REFERRED:**
REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:

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

DATED: August 17, 2016 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Cliff Goodhart, John Harrington, Dawn O’Kroley and Richard Slayton.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 17, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the demolition and addition to “Chabad House” located at 223 and 219 West Gilman Street in the Downtown Core. Appearing on behalf of the project were Mark Kruser, Hamid Noughani, Ron Trachtenberg and Mendel Matusof, representing Chabad House. Registered and speaking in opposition were Gene Devitt and Fred Mohs.

The existing easement will be relocated. Kruser and Noughani discussed the architecture with repeated patterns, columns to support the canopy and windows patterns. Building materials will include a complementary brick and panels above.

Fred Mohs spoke in opposition. This is adjacent to Mansion Hill and is in the Langdon Street National Historic District. He wants to keep the original houses that tell the story of Madison in its early days. This is a fixable house. His objection stems from historic preservation for this site.

Gene Devitt spoke in opposition. The neighborhood group would like to see the front of this house preserved with an addition to the backside. They do not want it to look like something that would front State Street. This is the beginning of the housing stock in a historic neighborhood. The dumpsters do not need a truck; they can be rolled out.

Trachtenberg noted that the team had a discussion about bringing the garbage out on the State Street side of the two buildings; ULI does not believe that is adequate and therefore will not grant a release of the center easement or the garbage easement. The only option left is to have the garbage picked up on the parking lot side.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- What kind of fence will shield the dumpsters?
 - It will be opaque.

- Are there design details, do we know what it looks like? How big it is?
- Right now we're putting all that concrete down without knowing what will happen in the future, for one car?

- We also need access to the driveway.

But there are other ways to achieve that. There are permeable blocks.

I agree, I think we should look at that.

That's a lot of pavement for one vehicle.

- Is there a way that your addition could provide your accessible route to the existing building, and that ramp could be removed so that there is still that opportunity for the easement between the houses?
 - We'd have to go over the property line and eliminate a bay.
 - I don't think that's negotiable with ULI. That setback allows us to have more penetrations in the building and provide a better façade.
- I remember the old driveways that had a patch of grass down the middle.
- I don't see the lighting plan in here.
- The driveway, the wall issue, we don't have any details whatsoever. I don't have any guidance on exactly what we expect or propose, we need something more significant than what they're suggesting. A screen wall, maybe a green wall? In earlier discussions with staff we talked about having to do something on that lot line on your property; right now all you're showing is hard pavement which is not acceptable (staff).
- I think the last conversation we had was how the proposed development will hold the street edge, and while this parking lot significantly erodes the block, you've chosen to set your new addition back significantly further than the existing face of the house.
 - Not much. It's only a few feet farther back.

The courtyard needs to hold the form of the street edge.

If you have chosen to erode the built form and now you've built this courtyard wall, your brick wall should be all the way to your property line. The parking lot side. You should be treating that entire courtyard and driveway as one form, and on occasion your vehicle would enter that.

- And when you do that, rethink the Carpinus species.
- The details of your building, how the new masonry intersects the existing masonry, make sure you have a clean detail so that in fact the addition could be removed, so you're not attempting to "tooth in" the addition. So the existing building is distinguishable if the addition is removed.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Braun-Oddo, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-1) with O'Kroley voting no. The motion noted the need to address minimization of hard pavement associated with parking, the front courtyard and landscape screening along the lot line with the City surface parking lot.