

## AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> December 16, 2009
TITLE: 621 Mendota Court (Formerly 617-619) – PUD(GDP-SIP), Residential Development in Downtown Design Zone No. 3. 8 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (16452)	<b>REFERRED:</b>
	<b>REREFERRED:</b>
	<b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: December 16, 2009	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn Weber, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner and Jay Ferm.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of December 16, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a residential development located at 621 Mendota Court. Appearing on behalf of the project were Mark Landgraf, representing Patrick Properties; Gary Brink, representing Landgraf Construction; Josh Wilcox, representing Landgraf Construction; Patrick Corcoran, Robert Barry, Camilla Corcoran, Sheri L. Barry and Robert R. Brodeur. Registered in opposition as Arlan Kay. Registered neither in support nor opposition was Chuck Possehl of the Bruce Company.

- In order to eliminate the previous concerns about the balconies being tacked on, two feet project into the building and projects three feet out. A combination of exterior moped parking and bike parking in association with off-street loading. One option features a 10' x 18' loading zone which maximizes the amount of combined moped and bike parking with the other option, Option A featuring 10' x 35' loading zone substantially decreasing the amount of moped and bike parking.
- The development of 28 units with a total of 104 bedrooms, a departure from the previous version of the project.
- An extensive overview of the project against the "Exterior and Interior Design Criteria for Planned Unit Development Districts and Downtown Design Zones" referencing a summary of its provisions as contained within the application packet.

Following the presentation, Arlan Kay spoke on behalf of Attorney Harvey Temkin who represents the owners of the adjacent properties at 626 Langdon and 616 & 625 Mendota Court. Kay provided an overview of the issues raised within a letter from Attorney Temkin relevant to the redevelopment proposal at 621 Mendota Court, utilizing a shared access easement located on the common boundary to the west for its use in association with this project as not consistent with the terms of the easement agreement. Specific concerns relative to impeding its use by the adjoining property owner for ingress and egress as well as refuse pick-up. Kay then presented photographic details of the existing condition between the adjoining properties to clarify their concerns. The letter from Temkin as well as Kay's presentation emphasize an alternative to relocate the building's entrance as well as all loading functions to the eastside of the building adjacent to an existing public pathway easement. Mark Landgraf spoke in support of the building, his appreciation for the architecture, his appreciation of the articulation of the design on the building as modified in support of maintaining the shared

access as a shared service core with the adjacent building at the same time, maintaining an emphasis that the adjacent ped/bike pathway on the east side of the building be maintained as currently exists which would prevent conflicts between vehicular and pedestrian/bike accumulation within the area. Josh Wilcox spoke in favor of the project noting that the entry within the existing location, adjacent to the service core was logical as proposed and ties back to the required design criteria. He further provided a discussion on the loading zone/bike and moped parking issues. Following the testimony, the Commission noted:

- As with the previous review of the project, lose spandrel panels between windows where walls intersect, should be dealt with an architectural solution.
- The use of a crushed rock path in the rear should be ADA compliant.
- Provide information on the height of adjacent buildings.
- Concern about too much going on with the detailing of the building's facades.
- Uplighting as proposed, not dark-sky compliant and should be utilized to emphasize the tower element.
- Architecture is heading in the right direction, but should be more of a "background building," too much going on with the building as designed. Let bookends stand out on the east elevation, problem with the middle section which features red-brick extending one level higher than the dark brown brick on the bookend elements, takes away from the bookends as a feature. Use benchline of the top of the red brick as horizontal line on the east elevation bringing up the dark brown brick treatment.
- The upper elevation of the building loses focus, too much going on.
- Relevant to the site plan, main entry as a terminus of the street adjacent to bike-pedestrian path logical, but maintain shared service access on the westerly elevation.
- The construction fence issue, a PC issue.
- Issue with the removal of existing elm along the southerly property line.
- Concern with the use of stone mulch in lieu of bark mulch. Stone mulch impedes plant growth.
- It appears garbage trucks are not losing anything in the easement with the modifications as proposed.
- Shift laundry to the basement or garden level to provide interior bike parking on level one adjacent to the exterior moped/bike-parking area and entry.
- On the north elevation, on levels four-six, add a window on the blank wall next to the patio doors.
- The use of two-level bike racks is commendable but look at an "assisted design that helps it up."
- Concern with the difference between the high level of contrast and materials according to the renderings vs. that displayed on the sample board, maintain a discernable difference in appearance.
- Concern with the use of eye-level vertical pier bollard lighting within the bike yard. Confirm light levels. Also with the concerned with the uplighting being dark-sky compliant study.
- Project attractive, show how gardens based for such patio at rear looks like a ground-level view.
- Take uplights and mount up higher and point down to be dark-sky compliant, like everything going on and don't feel the need to simplify detailing and materials associated with the building façade. Make red brick more red with EIFS color lighter for more contrast in the materials/color palette.
- The use of crushed granite is not a shovelable surface. Use color pavement in the rear garden area as well as use a different colored pavement in bike storage area. Keep as much outside moped for such bike storage as possible.
- The horizontal banding at the fourth floor level needs beefing up.
- Push transformer off and away from the pathway area and provide appropriate screening.
- Make side by parking entry (east) more inviting, more transparent.

- Add more trees to appeal to the pedestrians scale in the rear yard, columnar species.
- Study bringing the red brick up all the way up the mid-east elevation. Like entry on the west elevation off the building's westerly quarter, as proposed, it provides a separation from bicycles.
- Need a durable surface at the rear; durable paver or pavement, make path more efficient with the minimum amount of space provided; go straight in to allow for more landscaping.
- Eliminate the use of crab trees; favor the use of something more native.
- Eliminate the use of stone mulch in favor of shredded bark mulch.
- The use of red mulch, red pavers, and red plantings require more variation.
- Need to maintain the existing trees or provide an arbor's report on their condition to justify removal.
- On the south elevation, on levels two-six, the brick is truncated as it meets the EIFS; brick return needs to be provided where it meets the EIFS.
- The pattern of windows on levels two-three, compared with the pattern of windows on levels four-seven on the mid-east elevation don't relate and get lost at the lower level.
- Need better "hat or top" treatment on the tower element. There's a large void at the east corner of the building with no windows. Add windows to the corner bedroom and combination with down-sizing the extensively long balconies on levels four-eight.
- Eliminate horizontal lower band on south center element on the upper east elevation in order to complement book ends. Re-examine the horizontal banding above the third floor which breaks up the verticality of the book ends.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Weber, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0).

The motion required address of the above stated concerns and the following:

- Utilize bark mulch as an option to use of stone mulch.
- Lighting needs to be dark-sky compliant.
- Study southeast corner at northeast corner to bring room to the front in combination with a reduction in balcony length.
- Study backyard details including the paths ADA compliancing.
- Study swapping the laundry room and bike storage areas.
- Study making rear yard "a room" – a physically contained space.
- Need full-view of penthouse, needs to be more integrated.
- Provide brick returns on all elevations where it meets EIFS.

A substitute motion by Ferm, seconded by Rummel, to grant initial approval failed on a vote of (2-6) with Wagner, Harrington, Barnett, Slayton, Weber and Smith voting no. 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 5, 5, 5, 6 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 621 Mendota Court**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	4	6	5	5	-	5	5	5
	5	5.5	5	-	-	5	6.5	5
	6	4	6	6	-	6	6	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	5	6	5	6	-	6	6	6
	6	6.5	6	6	-	6	8	6
	7	6	5	5	-	7	7	-

General Comments:

- Needs to better address context of site.
- Improved. But still too busy from an architectural design standpoint – calm down!
- Nice balcony adaptation. Use durable surface at patio. Use shredded bark mulch (not stone).
- Excellent package – thank you. Thorough presentation. Much improved. Good articulation. Color palette should have more pop. Show garden level. Downtown Design Guidelines appear to be met. Make west façade more like street facing façade.