

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: December 9, 2015

TITLE: 1000 East Washington Avenue – New
Development in UDD No. 8. 2nd Ald. Dist.
(40049)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: December 9, 2015

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Slayton, Acting Chair; John Harrington, Sheri Carter, Lois Braun-Oddo, Michael Rosenblum, Cliff Goodhart* and Tom DeChant.

Goodhart recused.

Staff noted that final approval could not be provided on this project due to a late posting of a companion ordinance amendment allowing for additional building height in UDD No. 8 as proposed with this project.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 9, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INTIAL APPROVAL** of new development in UDD No. 8 located at 1000 East Washington Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Paul Raisleger and Rich Arnesen, both representing Stone House Development; Abbie Moilien, representing Ken Saiki Design; and Patty Prime, representing the neighborhood steering committee. Registered neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak was Marsha Cannon. The corner piece would be copper or terra cotta panel. The masonry in the center piece is now a wood grain panel in either a tone or texture, as well as the accent pieces on the office portion of the building with all the window frames in the same color. Manufactured stone will tie in with Breese Stevens. The overhang on the restaurant area has been raised a bit. On the townhouse side, the bay window has been pushed in. Small scale trees are proposed in order to maintain the patio space with an inability to provide for canopy trees within the required setback along East Washington Avenue. The Secretary noted that in the district street trees are required in both the private and public areas and asked Moilien to work with Planning, City Engineering, Park Forestry and Fire to resolve this issue. Bicycle parking is gathered throughout the site. Rooftop patios are proposed on the 3rd floor and 11th floor that include screening, fireplaces and planters.

Patty Prime spoke in support as a member of the neighborhood steering committee. In general the neighborhood is happy to see the affordable housing components of this proposal. The reception to the design was lukewarm; it looks too beige and somewhat like a dorm. Other comments include that the patterning is too busy, the corner of Mifflin and Breatly Streets looks like a medical office. Overall the neighborhood likes the project and hope to see it move forward.

Marsha Cannon spoke as a member of the neighborhood steering committee. She noted the cooperation of the developer has been helpful. There are so many similar designs it's hard to distinguish. This building needs to be

something everyone wants to look at for at least another 30 years. She has concerns with how the building looks without any trees and doesn't look residential. It seems industrial and unwelcoming; it needs to be softened. The neighborhood contains houses that are 75-100 years old and do not have flat roofs. This is further into the neighborhood than the Constellation or the Galaxie and she would like to see some consideration given to softening the design. There is a lot of glass in this design and there are a lot of birds nearby because of the lakes. She would like to see bird-friendly glass used, especially on the 11th floor. Raisleger did note that bird-friendly glass costs about 1/3 more than regular glass.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- On the 2-3 story mass along East Washington Avenue as it returns around the corner, make it more similar in color and tone. It was more successful at the last version because horizontal spandrel would be less prominent.
- The glass at the top along East Washington Avenue is good.
- The right-hand entry is elegant.
- The intermediate band on the 2-3 story level needs to be more secondary; it reads too pronounced.
- Study entry at 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor levels to allow the 2nd and 3rd floor masses to read as stronger columns. Also in the same area, more glass, lighter.
- The tower revisions were successful.
- I think for exceptional design for that 11th story, I would require bird-friendly glass.
- I'd like to have that be something we come back to. If you decide not to use it, it's not just missed.
 - Is that something we can discuss at the next go-round, looking at the overall project? Or is that going to be a UDD No. 8 requirement?
- You've got so much glass on the top, it's going to be an issue. That could be a problem.
- I'd like to reinforce the comment about lightening the horizontal band in the middle. I strongly concur with that.
- I have a concern about the use of EIFS given that it's low (primarily of the north elevation on square shaped features).
 - The finish is the same scratch coat that you paint. It's what you put behind it, that's very durable and hard.
- I too have concerns about the use of EIFS.
- (Secretary) We're going to take a look at the zoning criteria for that, at the same time this Commission is of record about the use of EIFS on anything within the first floor plane.
- Is it possible to have a cross section through the planters, when the street tree issue is resolved, so we can get a better look at what that would be like at street level.
- The landscaping is good. I might have concern about how well the Boxwoods will do given the kind of conditions they're surrounded with. The big issue for me is the street trees (as required according to the provisions of UDD No. 8).

ACTION:

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Braun-Oddo, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0-2) with Goodhart recused. The motion provided for address of comments made during discussion of the project.

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 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1000 East Washington Avenue

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