

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: January 22, 2014
TITLE: 901 East Washington Avenue – New Construction of a 5-Story Addition to the Klueter Grocery Warehouse and Parking Facilities in UDD No. 8. 6 th Ald. Dist. (31109)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: January 22, 2014	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Cliff Goodhart, Lauren Cnare, Melissa Huggins and Tom DeChant.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 22, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of new construction located at 901 East Washington Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Michael Schmidt and Doug Hursh, both representing Archipelago Village, LLC; Steve Harms, representing Tri-North Builders; and Curtis Brink. Ald. Marsha Rummel remarked that in general there is a lot of neighborhood support for the revitalization of this building and the block in general. The only negative she can recall is the stair tower on the corner piece and whether there would be too much light escaping (the tower has been removed from the corner so it is now internal). Harms addressed issues contained in the Planning Division staff report and UDD No. 8 requirements. The setback is supposed to be exactly 15-feet, which this is not. Relative to that issue the parking is supposed to equal that setback. The landscaping plan requires 40-feet on center, with their plan including two extra trees. The percent of openings in the façade is supposed to be 40% glass on East Washington Avenue; right now it is at 34%. Hursh then noted the changes that have been made, including moving the stair tower internally, active spaces in the corners with conference rooms, more glass, the mechanical penthouse is now at the center with the buildings being more in line with the existing building. On the rear of the building they highlighted the entry element with a larger canopy and removed one of the brick panels so it is located where the existing Klueter building is. The metal and glass façade wraps around with the remaining brick on the front of the building. The concept for the brick material is meant to show what the existing brick looks like (and will be impossible to match); this contemporary addition is to be complementary with less black and a smoother texture in the brick palette. Heather Stouder, Planning Division remarked that staff is supportive of the land use request, and see the parking as an interim solution. Staff would generally like to see more screening of the parking area but understand the financial constraints for something temporary. They would also like to see more brick on the building but are open to other ideas. A bit more work to achieve the 40% openings seems achievable. Wagner suggested that the Plan Commission could put a time limit on the surface parking issue.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Can you speak to the glazing of the restroom corridor? You're being awfully creative. I wish those restrooms weren't on that face still.
- Could you speak to how one approaches the building from the back corner.
 - There will be a set of steps from the asphalt parking area, as well as a ramp system to get up to the back door. It really is the back door but in some ways that's where everyone will enter because the parking lot is right there. That's also the main entrance for the first floor retail operation, whatever that is.

Right now it looks like your ADA entrance. Your site plan is hard to read; I would look at what design features you have so you have cues as to where to approach. The canopy on the back helps. For an inexpensive amount you could make this feel like more of "a place." I still am confused on how someone would know where to pull in, park and enter the building.

That entrance from the parking lot is where everyone will come in. We made a wide hallway when you enter, we have a 12-foot lobby with all the light coming in from the elevator tower.

It just looks like a hole in the wall now.

- The parking stalls located on the ends of the island should be islands to protect that end car. You need another island in the line to break that up, it's a maximum of 12 stalls. That's Zoning Code versus UDD.
- Think about temporary planters by that entrance, something to make it more evident and inviting.
- The new design is nice, but the issue about whether it complements the existing building – my comment last time was that there is a lot going on. If there was some element, whether it's proportion or material, particularly on the south perspective where you're actually recladding the existing building to bring some more harmony within the entire composition. To me it looks like a metal clad office building up against an older building, and it's a good looking building but I'm still looking for some element to really tie them together a bit more on the elevations, particularly unify the south and east perspectives where I see three things going on and maybe there could be just two things going on; the old brick, the new brick the metal and the glass.
 - We wanted to at least highlight where the old building was, sort of recladding it while not matching exactly, a similar window pattern, so it helps break up the mass of the building. I think it's a softer façade using brick rather than all metal.

My point is a little bit more rational continuity.

- I think it's a good building as it is. If I saw something else I might be able to make a judgment but I like this building.
- The comment about how the two talk to each other (existing building vs. the addition) is one that should be taken into consideration because there are some major horizontal lines on the Klueter building. Right now if you covered one side or the other there's nothing reminiscent of the two of them having a dialogue other than an appropriate brick match for different elements where they don't touch. The materials are nice but you don't see a dialogue between the two.
- It's probably going to be a much more subtle transition than what we're all focusing on in the renderings.

ACTION:

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Cnare, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0).

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 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 901 East Washington Avenue

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

General Comments:

- Handsome addition – could use some refinement integrating old to new design elements.
- Like the direction this building is going in. Surface parking on East Washington is weak point.