

AGENDA # 11

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 4, 2020
TITLE: 605 South Point Road/9502, 9506, 9510 Watts Road/604 Feather Sound Drive/9403, 9405, 9407 Harvest Moon Lane – Major Alteration to an Approved Residential Building Complex. 9 th Ald. Dist. (62607)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: November 4, 2020	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Tom DeChant, Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Syed Abbas, Russell Knudson, Christian Harper.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 4, 2020, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of material substitutions, with the exception of EIFS, for a Residential Building Complex located at 605 South Point Road/9502, 9506, 9510 Watts Road/604 Feather Sound Drive/9403, 9405, 9407 Harvest Moon Lane. Registered and speaking in support was Ulian Kissiov, representing The Edison, LLC.

The Secretary noted that the UDC was advisory for granting the recommendation of approval to the Plan Commission. The proposed alterations to the façade for materials was referred from the Planning Division Director. Of the six approved buildings, one is already showing the materials proposed vs. what was approved. The Commission should make a recommendation on the appropriateness of the materials, including a change from limestone veneer to EIFS.

Kissiov stated that bids came in too high and way over budget. They could have taken the approach to simplify the elevations and apply for new design, but decided to save aesthetics as approved and achieve savings by using cheaper materials. Architectural shingles vs. standing seam saves \$1 million, and limestone EIFS vs. limestone veneer for saves another \$1 Million. They did other value engineering throughout the building. This change is critical in keeping the project affordable, feasible and sustainable. The look of the limestone finish is as close as possible to the original limestone, overall the architectural image remains virtually unchanged, and contributes to the overall energy efficiency of the building. He remarked that they applied for that minor alteration a month ago and after it was approved by the Alder and Planning Director as minor alteration the EIFS was installed.

Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator clarified that there was no alteration approved for proceeding with the building material changes or installation of non-compliant material. It has been submitted as a minor alteration request but the Director had this referred prior to approval for an advisory recommendation.

The Commission discussed the following:

- The use of EIFS in this particular instance, where we limit it to accents and other areas in some zoning districts and not others, this is not one of those that strictly limits it?
- (Tucker) The residential districts don't have a building material requirement but common practice with many of the residential multi-family building projects has been the installation of quality durable materials, particularly at the base. It's a common condition which is why those requirements were pulled into the Zoning Code for other districts.
- I'm not sure what we're looking at on these last few slides. The examples of existing homes and then it looks like something under construction and the rendering of the EIFS and the wood. What are the vinyl clad homes?
- I think it's irrelevant. They've gone ahead and done it and are begging forgiveness, the earlier photos are the best representation because they already did it.
- (Tucker) I took these photos today. It's pretty rare for the City to be providing materials for you to consider like this, it's on the applicant to submit these. The applicant is in and this work is done. This is coming very 11th hour, I'm not all that comfortable with them being the thing you use to make a decision one way or the other. COVID keeps you from touching materials, he did put them at the back end but these photos show what exists, how it was applied and how it feels.
- What kind of a precedent might we be setting here?
- The substitution of the EIFS for limestone I understand. Is it the wood component or the darker component?
 - The siding material initially was LP smart side composite painted wood. The owner decided to use better quality material, in this case aluminum siding with wood grain, maintenance free.
- I'm not clear on what's being asked of us. To approve the substitution or have them tear it off?
- This is not so much an enforcement issue as, just pretend it never happened, they want to put EIFS and aluminum siding and we approved something else, so we have to approve this in its place.
- I know it sets a poor precedent but I don't see another option. I don't know what else we would do.
- There are six buildings total on the site, replacement of different material for all six buildings. The other ones are not built yet.
- (Tucker) This is the one building that's built. This is their problem to fix, not yours. They designed them, went through the energy efficiency without EIFS. Completely their creation. One other shingled roof is put on but only one has exterior materials. Fixing the problem they created for themselves is another body's problem.
- We have the ability to make a nuanced recommendation, the shingled roof can stay but this other material has to be replaced. They initially came to us and said it's going to be limestone veneer, we didn't tell them to do that in the first place.
- We're very clear on EIFS use.
- (Secretary) I can summarize the three materials requesting to be replaced: change from metal roof to shingled roof, change from a cement lap board siding to metal siding, change from limestone to EIFS.
 - It's not cement board it's composite wood, not a huge difference. The new material is a better quality, cedar rendition siding. The other two materials that is correct. It's a huge stretch over the initial budget.
- If these materials were before us the first time it wouldn't change my opinion of the roof material. Not a huge fan of the wood composite and I might ask for more commentary from the architects but it doesn't seem like that's the case here. The EIFS is the one that sends the red flags, but I don't know if this is down at the base.
- I agree that the roofing material would not have changed my opinion of the design, the architect does good work. The cement metal doesn't bother me that much, it's got a sheen I'm not crazy about. The

limestone to the EIFS is what's giving me a problem especially at that lower level. I understand accepting EIFS above a certain level.

- There would be a seam there where the one material transitions.
- You're going to see the marked difference in the materials.
- On the townhouses changing from limestone to EIFS is even worse.
- Could the applicant come back with an option for replacing the third material and we can make a motion for accepting the change of roof material and cement siding material?
- Absolutely, we're not necessarily obligated to accommodate this violation.
- (Tucker) The applicant can always come back at any time for an alteration. Don't feel like you have one shot at this. There is a timeliness question, my office is not going to let any of those buildings proceed with the siding issue unresolved, it puts us in a very difficult position regarding enforcement.
- UDC is advisory to the Planning Director on this.
- The Director can take your advisement and approve something as a compromise, or the seam issue could be sorted out tomorrow.
- Amending the motion where EIFS is not used on that first floor level. Accept material substitutions with the exception of EIFS on the first floor all the way up to the beginning of the second floor.

ACTION:

On a motion by Bernau, seconded by Braun-Oddo, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL** of the material changes change from metal roof to shingled roof, and from a composite wood siding to metal siding. The Commission did not recommend approval of the change from limestone to EIFS. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0).