

## AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> May 20, 2009
TITLE: 1900 East Washington Avenue -- PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development in Urban Design District No. 4. 12 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (13195)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: May 20, 2009	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Ron Luskin, Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, John Harrington, Richard Slayton and Dawn Weber.

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 20, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1900 East Washington Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were John W. Sutton, Douglas Kozel and Ald. Satya Rhodes-Conway. Prior to the presentation on this item, staff apprised the Commission of Planning Division issues relevant to the project as a follow up to previous discussions with Brad Murphy, Director of the Planning Division at the Commission's April 28, 2007 meeting; where the Commission requested input from Planning staff on up and coming projects requiring Plan Commission review that would effect their consideration of a project. Staff noted the following issues:

- No color renderings with shadow lines were provided with the application as submitted as required.
- Issue with a large degree of exposure of a concrete foundation on and at the southwest elevation.
- Lack of a straight-on elevation and perspective renderings that detail how the building's architectural features relate to the prominent corner of an enlarged development site.
- An issue with the amount of cement masonry units (CMU) at ground level elevations regarding its appearance and coarseness.
- Missing arcade elevations.
- Lack of context provided with project as proposed with existing adjacent structures and block faces.
- Lack of clear details on how the building materials and color palette works all together.
- Fully delineated lighting details, including LED lighting elements.
- The absence of specific signage package; where the applicant remarked it would return for future separate consideration.

Following staff comments, Ald. Satya Rhodes-Conway spoke on the project noting issues as follows:

- The project is now proposed to be rental but built to condominium standards, where rental is a concern with neighborhood which requires on-site management and standards of an apartment association.
- Concern with building demolition outside of the corner building; the removal of existing residential housing stock.

- Once buildings are demolished concern with a mini “Union Corners” along with the need for guarantee of financing.

Following Rhodes-Conway’s comments, the Commission agreed that the financing guarantee associated with the demolition was a Plan Commission issue but noted concerns with effect on design and that any changes should come back to UDC. Sutton followed with review of the building architecture and materials as follows, noting expanded arcade across both street façades, along with a review of landscape plan details emphasizing utilization of rain gardens. The rain gardens and other amenities provide for an increase in pervious by 30% over the existing conditions. Discussion by the Commission on the revised plans were as follows:

- Need a corner perspective rendering, provide arcade elevational details, provide color elevations with shadow lines, provide architectural detailing and context with existing adjacent buildings and adjacent block faces.
- The back parking lot needs to be divided up more to provide for more landscaping.
- Too many stalls in a row incorporate an additional tree island provided at an interval of 12 stalls.
- Replace the Skyline Locust for Majestic or Moraine Honey Locust.
- Eliminate stone mulch for bark mulch; stone mulch is not good for plants due to heat effect issues and lack of organic matter.
- Eliminate black plastic edging in favor of steel around planting beds.
- Use a “Little Blue Stem” along East Washington Avenue needs more sun. Also concern with trees in upper plaza, need daylighting all day long, in addition to sun and air circulation.
- Identify rain garden planting species, in addition to providing information on the soil mix.
- The use of “grow low” Sumac needs to be done with some separation from adjoining plantings.
- The Hawthorne branching pattern is low and may force people out of branches’ way, especially in a seating area. Continue the sedum across and replace spirea with grasses along First Street.
- Use stark coarse stone mulch to not compete with coloration of the building.
- Need to show details of the arcade behind with elevations, also show railings and stair details.
- Signage details need to come back with details on the LED lighting confirmed.

#### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0). The motion provided for initial approval subject to the above stated concerns and as follows:

- Provide changes to the planting plan as recommended.
- Utilize bark mulch everywhere except dark stone adjacent to the building.
- Do a line of day lily or sedum to replace spirea.
- Provide full rain garden details, including planting species’ name and soil mix.
- Get rid of sumac next to rain garden.
- Delete stall for a tree island.
- Replace Honey Locust species.
- Thornless Cockspur Hawthorne has an issue with its horizontal canopy; replace with a Washington, which is more upright.
- Edging next to planting beds should be metal not black plastic.
- Provide fully detailed colored perspective renderings and elevations of the intersection and corner; blow-up stair and rail details, provide context of building with adjacent structures, upgrade planting details to include number and sizes and provide arcade elevations.

- Eliminate the use of EIFS on lower portions of the first floor elevation.
- Rethink bike parking as proposed. Issue with ramp corner and backing out into car circulation.

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 6, 6, 6.5, 6.5, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1900 East Washington Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	7	5	6	6	6	7	7
	-	6	5	-	-	6	6	6
	6	6	5	-	-	6	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	6	7	5	6	5	-	7	6.5
	6	7	5	-	-	-	7	6.5

General Comments:

- Masonry wall inherent to concept. Show detail of arcade and railing contrasting masonry, the contrast is key to the scheme. Strengthen landscape.
- Avoid residential approach to planting (bold lines unbroken). Dark stone mulch at wall only, bark elsewhere.
- Very nice conceptually, but provide more detail – context, color on drawings, façade...

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: April 1, 2009
TITLE: 1900 East Washington Avenue – PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development in Urban Design District No. 4. 12 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (13195)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: April 1, 2009	ID NUMBER:

---

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Mark Smith, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Jay Ferm, Dawn Weber, Marshal Rummel, Ron Luskin and Todd Barnett.

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 1, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1900 East Washington Avenue.

Kozel and Sutton provided an update on recent revisions to the plan noting the following:

- 12 inch masonry base at the street along East Washington and First Street.
- The need for building a concrete base to deal with the 2 inch grade change with utilization of the split-face block with the main body of the building to feature the use of cypress siding.
- The sign boards for the first floor commercial retail feature the utilization of alucabond.
- The landscape plan currently under development will provide for the use of more natural grasses and plantings as departure from the plan contained within the application packet.
- A proposed rain garden will be provided along the westerly lot line.
- The second floor plaza area will feature the use of intensive and extensive green roof with sedum plantings which will reduce the amount of hard surface.
- An elevator has been added to serve upper floor residential units.

Following the presentation, Ald. Satya Rhodes-Conway spoke on the ongoing neighborhood process in regard to the project. She noted the project the was vastly improved as well as noting concerns both for and against the project as follows:

- Massing and shadowing concerns and issues with three of the four buildings meeting demolition standards.
- Want to see building articulated better with address to sustainability and energy efficiency issues, lead certification, etc.
- Neighborhood concern with mass and scale of building in context with what exists around it.
- Those in favor of the project like the arcade feature, the provision of additional retail in the neighborhood, and it's status as an infill project.

Discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- Strong concept, strong cold face with light warm structure behind, worried about getting a 30-inch drop on one side and want to fill in with 30 inch railings. Sutton's response was that the project will feature a continuous rail on the inside arcade masonry with the need for a retaining wall on a portion of the curvilinear wall.
- Would be cool if a street tree could be in the arcade, but not possible. Show existing street trees in elevation of plans and it's effect on plantings in terrace in front of building.
- Cool design.
- Consider green technology, LED lighting and close cell insulation.
- The use of "Hophornbeam" is a problem; salt-sensitive.

**ACTION:**

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

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 6, 7, 7, 8 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1900 East Washington Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	8		7		8	9	8
								info
	7	7					8	7
		7	6			5	6	6
	6.5	7	6			6	7.5	7
		7						
								8

General Comments:

- Strong architectural design – good start. Question of demolition remains.
- Great project!
- Strong concept for an impossible site.
- Very nice before, very nice now.

**Firchow, Kevin**

---

**From:** Rhodes-Conway, Satya  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 08, 2009 10:54 PM  
**To:** Firchow, Kevin  
**Subject:** FW: Plans submitted for development at 1900-1916 E. Washington

Kevin -

Please include this as comment.

Satya

---

On Sun, Mar 8, 2009 at 10:43 PM, Colleen F. Moore <[cfmoore@wisc.edu](mailto:cfmoore@wisc.edu)> wrote:

Hi Satya,

I don't have time to attend the meetings.

No matter what the plans, I am very concerned about the council approving demolitions UNLESS the financing for the new construction is actually really really available. Which it probably isn't. We don't need to have our neighborhood look decimated during the recession.

No demolitions should be approved unless the request shows financing for the plans,, OR the buildings being demolished are a public nuisance or hazard.

We already have a big blank space on E. Wash just about 5 blocks east. We don't need another semi-abandoned bunch of lots.

thanks for your work,  
colleen

-----  
 "Up, up--slowly up--toiling up the long, calm wave; then balanced on its summit a while ... we plunge headlong into the seething abyss, till arrested, we glide upward again. ... Now buried in watery billows--our sail idly flapping; then lifted aloft--canvas bellying; and beholding the furthest horizon." -- Herman Melville from *Mardi--and a voyage hither*, 1849

-----  
[http://www.silentscourge.com/Children\\_and\\_Pollution.html](http://www.silentscourge.com/Children_and_Pollution.html)

Colleen F. Moore

124 N 4th St.

Madison, WI 53704

608 263-4868 (work)      608 249-7511 (home)

[cfmoore@wisc.edu](mailto:cfmoore@wisc.edu)

-----