

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: July 23, 2014

TITLE: 739 Williamson Street – Rezoning from TR-V1 to PD for Construction of a New 12-Unit Apartment Building. 6th Ald. Dist. (34926)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 23, 2014

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Melissa Huggins, Acting Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, and Dawn O’Kroley.

Wagner and Slayton recused themselves on this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 23, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a rezoning from TR-V1 to PD for construction of a new 12-unit apartment building located at 739 Williamson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Michael Matty and Chris Oddo. Registered neither in support nor opposition and available to answer questions was Michael Soref, representing the Marquette Neighborhood Association. The building footprint has gotten smaller, although the apartment has gone from an 8-unit to a 12-unit building. They studied the neighborhood very closely. Pedestrian safety was studied in relation to the placement of driveways and entrances. Vines are proposed to grow on the elevator/trellis. Building materials have been simplified to fiber cement siding (3” and 6”), and a flush panel in the same product line. They have moved away from the gable roof form. They are working through criteria from their meeting with the Landmarks Commission. Depending on what kind of system they use, the HVAC louvers could show on the two side elevations, or condensing units could be placed on the roof.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Are the angled supports required structurally?
 - No they aren’t part of the structure. It’s something to add interest and define the corners.
- Is the roof accessible for the residents?
 - No, it’s not. We’re looking at a live roof system, but we’re not sure. You can see the patterning on the roofline that suggests what we’re thinking.
- The breaking down to scale to the more historic lot size is nice. Referring to the property on the right, the treatment, the previous images had some clean modern forms, and this one I’m just curious because of the way the same material is treated across the full façade, that the roof form undulates so much it loses that purity. Balconies that clip on might seem stronger, otherwise the roof form is getting a bit

complex for the façade being taught in all the same material. I don't know if I'm as excited about the panels, going back to the precedent.

- In terms of massing and the appropriateness of the property behind on the rear elevation, how this breaks down nicely to emulate two parcels, that feels like one building. I don't know if the setback is substantial enough or appropriate to the scale of the historic buildings.
- Can you see over the balconies when you're sitting?
 - There's a 4" gap. We did look at having open vertical balusters. I was trying to simplify things. Open up the railing on the upper decks to see out of patio doors.
- My first inkling of seeing a new building, I was expecting more void. In reality that is void behind but we're hiding it.
- I like your idea of the vine. You'll need a vine that grows tall, which is not going to be easy here. If you want to maintain the feeling of that trellis form you'll want to use something really small leafed, and those are more difficult to find.
- I'm curious about the timing of construction because I can recall some other projects that were approved with the modern construction, and seeing that the other properties would be equitably restored. It seems like there's a lag there.
 - This is now a lot standing on its own. But as soon as we get the permission we'll start the restoration on the historic house.

ACTION:

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

No rankings were provided for this item.