

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: February 16, 2015
TITLE: 114 N. Bedford Street – Multi-family Housing Adjacent to a Landmark – Doyle Administration Building. 4 th Ald. District. Contact: Melissa Huggins (36432)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: February 16, 2015	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, Jason Fowler, David McLean, Marsha Rummel, and Michael Rosenblum. Rummel; arrived at 5:30 p.m. during discussion of Item 2 and Fowler left at 6:15 p.m. during discussion of Item 4.

SUMMARY:

Chris Johnson, representing CA Ventures, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Tom Chinnock, representing CA Ventures, registering in support and wishing to speak. Chinnock briefly introduced the project and how the proposed development will be compatible with the existing context. He explained the exterior views and how the massing and materials relate to the context and the adjacent landmark building.

Levitan asked that Chinnock address the comments in the staff report. Chinnock explained that the larger brick size helps reduce the overall building mass and scale and provides a cost savings. He explained that the project team chose to use the articulation detail found on the Doyle building on the brick areas of the proposed development; that the actual wood siding would be replaced with a siding product that would relate to the residential context; that the townhome rhythm would be enhanced by making the front doors a prominent yellow color; that the landscape elements will be curved as presented; and that the project team didn't feel that the canopy element was necessary.

Rosenblum asked what staff would prefer as the material in lieu of siding. Staff explained that brick is preferable, but metal or composite panel could be considered as long as it did not have a wood grain and did not try to emulate traditional horizontal lapped or beveled siding.

There was general discussion by Gehrig and Rosenblum that the project was not so large or visually intrusive. McLean explained that the project may not be so large, but that it may be visually intrusive. McLean explained that the top and bottom of the building do not work together and that the vertical brick articulation was not compatible with the rest of the design which may be contributing to this visual intrusiveness. Levitan explained that the ordinance language says "or" not "and". McLean acknowledged the difference.

There was general discussion about the prominence of the elevation as viewed from the Kohl Center parking lot. Johnson explained that there has been discussion about the UW Arts building being located in that parking lot.

Slattery explained that the building size seemed acceptable adjacent to the landmark building.

Sara Tocci, representing CA Ventures, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Ryan Sadow, representing CA Ventures, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Melissa Huggins, representing CA Ventures, registering in support and available to answer questions.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Gehrig, to recommend to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission that the project is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjoining landmark. The motion passed on a vote of (4:1). Ayes: Fowler, Gehrig, Slattery, Rosenblum. Nays: McLean. Levitan does not vote. Rummel was not present.

Levitan asked that the Commission discuss the design comments in the staff report. Gehrig expressed concern about moving the comments forward. McLean and Levitan felt it was important to let the other Commissions know that the Landmarks Commission had strong feelings about the design adjacent to the landmark building. There was general discussion about the design comments in the staff report.

Levitan explained that he was pleased that the staff report separated the ordinance related issues from the design issues even though the issues are interrelated.

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Rosenblum, to include the design comments from the staff report and the related discussion in the recommendation to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission. The motion passed by voice vote/other.