

AGENDA # 12

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: December 2, 2020
TITLE: 1825-1837 Aberg Avenue – Referral from Planning Division Director, Alteration to an Approved 4-Story Mixed-Use Building and 2-Story 6-Unit Townhouse Building. 12 th Ald. Dist. (63076)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: December 2, 2020	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Craig Weisensel, Jessica Klehr, Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Russel Knudson, Rafeeq Asad, Tom DeChant and Shane Bernau.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 2, 2020, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMENDED APPROVAL** of roof form changes to an approved project located at 1825-1837 Aberg Avenue. Registered and speaking in support was Kevin Burow, representing Knothe & Bruce Architects, LLC. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Bob Feller, representing Madisonian Development, LLC; and Jim Rodgers,

Burow gave site context and information on the previous design with flat roofs. The owner of the project would like a projecting roof. Comparison views were shown of the originally approved project and the changes proposed for the introduction of a new roof element. This makes the two buildings consistent. The Planning Division Director is looking for feedback on the roof form change, how it relates to the façade design that was previously approved and how the change in roof form impacts the design.

The Commission discussed the following:

- The context and what you’ve shown relates really well, I don’t see it as any dramatic change to what you had. It’s a different design option, which there always is. I see it as an acceptable alternative.
- I’d say similar, the original obviously had this cap element and overhang to it already. The one thing I’m assuming is you’re going from a storm pipe system to more of a gutter system with the new design?
 - No it will still be internally drained, the majority of the roof behind is still a flat roof.
- It would not be dripping down onto those people on the balconies?
 - No it would be beyond the face of those balconies.
- I really appreciate your use of diversity in your renderings, it’s very important to me. You consistently have a diverse population of images in your renderings and I really appreciate that.
- I like this, I think it looks nice, it’s a nice cap or top for this building.
- Look-wise I don’t think this is a big deal, a long view down Aberg would be noticeable. Consistency with the townhomes is fine. But dealing with the rain is a bigger issue. While these aren’t huge buildings that’s still an appreciable amount of square footage up there and absent gutters handling it somehow in a

heavy downpour that would be a sheet of water coming off of those down below. We don't want to see downspouts marring this otherwise nice clean façade, some way of handling the rain rather than just a straight run off, I don't see that working in this situation.

- They're handling it internally. It's a "fake" mansard roof.
 - 80% of the roof is internal for draining.
- It still seems problematic in a heavy storm, but not a deal-killer.
- One of the renderings showing the relationship to the smaller building looks like you went from a darker shingle to a lighter shingle. A darker shingle on those buildings would be preferable.

ACTION:

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by Klehr, the Urban Design Commission **RECOMMEND APPROVAL** of the roof form changes. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0).