

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: October 5, 2016
TITLE: 810 East Washington Avenue – Galaxie Phase 3: Starliner Condominiums and Lofts. 2 nd Ald. Dist. (44542)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Jessica Vaughn, Acting Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: October 5, 2016	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Richard Slayton, Cliff Goodhart, Lois Braun-Oddo, John Harrington, Rafeeq Asad and Sheri Carter.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 5, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of the Galaxie Phase 3 located at 810 East Washington Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Kyle Dumbleton, representing Midwest Modern, LLC; and Lee Christensen, representing Gebhardt Development. The building design has changed slightly, with the major alteration in the number of units, going from 43 to 45. There is a strong mid-block connection. The deep ins and outs are gone. The two public entrances have been moved closer to the pedestrian connection. The condominium building has six units per floor with walk-up entrances on the first floor. The rest of the tenants will enter off a corner lobby off East Mifflin Street and the pedestrian courtyard. Concrete block is proposed as the base material, with gray composite panel and a wood version of the product proposed. The building will contain eleven work-live units. All of the condominiums and most of the live-work units will have balconies.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Provide detailed blow-ups of the landscaping.
- Work to bring back the horizontal movement.
- I was walking in front of the East Washington Avenue façade, and there is a double row of trees by Festival Foods. But the planting areas from that half down to Paterson, there are no real trees there. You have the planting areas but no trees, so we don't get that double allay effect on the east side of that block. I hope they're still coming because I was very disappointed they weren't there.
- That needs to be taken care of.
- The owner occupied original versus the proposed; the original had a real dynamic look to it and it was really nicely layered. There could still be some work done to bring back some of that horizontal movement that was there. The comment isn't that you have to make that match with those pieces, the comment is about the layering and the dynamic nature of the composition. A little bit of refining or how you treat the mullions.
 - I can definitely explore different material.

- Maybe a horizontal metal panel. Look at how the roof had that nice consistent line and it had that shadow line. Now it gets really flush up to the street side on the fourth floor. It had a nice rhythm of those nice “column covers,” and composition had a nice rhythm and proportion to it.
 - The staff recommendation is try to deal with the landscape, administratively if possible.
- It sounded like the landscape needs to come back anyway.
- The height and mass are there, but the skin isn’t refined.
- It seemed to have more variation than the mass they are now submitting.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0).