

**AGENDA # 1**

City of Madison, Wisconsin

**REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION**

**PRESENTED:** December 10, 2012

**TITLE:** 210 Langdon Street – Demolish existing building and construct new fraternity adjacent to a designated landmark (Chi Phi Fraternity) and in the Langdon Street National Register Historic District. 2nd Ald. District. Contact: Randy Bruce (28485)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Amy Scanlon, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** December 10, 2012

**ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Gehrig, Vice Chair; Jason Fowler, Christina Slattery, and David McLean. Marsha Rummel and Michael Rosenblum were excused.

**SUMMARY:**

Randy Bruce, 7601 University Avenue, representing Theta Chi & Knothe & Bruce, registering in support and wishing to speak. Mr. Bruce briefly described the proposed project including an description of the context, front setback, building height, architectural style (Collegiate Gothic), and building materials.

Mr. Bruce explained that the concerns in the staff report can be met. He also confirmed that EIFS would be used for the upper stories.

Levitan asked staff if the proposal would be acceptable if it were located in a local historic district. Staff explained that the existing structural concerns for this structure would still be the same concerns in a local district. Staff also explained that the ordinance criteria would be similar to other new development criteria regarding mass and scale and similar character and materials. Aside from questioning the appropriateness of EIFS, staff believes the proposed building would be appropriate in a local historic district.

Jason Tish, 2714 LaFollette Avenue, representing Madison Trust for Historic Preservation, registering neither in support nor opposition and not wishing to speak.

**ACTION:**

A motion was made by Slattery, seconded by Gehrig, to advise the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds that the proposed building is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the adjacent landmark, and that the architectural concerns in the staff report should be incorporated in the design, and while the existing building has historic value, the significant structural issues have influenced this decision. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

---

**Regarding:** 210 Langdon Street – Demolish the existing building and construct a 3-story fraternity house adjacent to a designated landmark (Chi Phi Fraternity) and in the Langdon Street National Register Historic District.  
2nd Ald. District  
**Contact:** J. Randy Bruce  
(Legistar #28485)

---

**Date:** December 10, 2012  
**Prepared By:** Amy Scanlon, Preservation Planner

---

**General Information:**

The Applicant is requesting to demolish one structure that consists of a contributing structure and a noncontributing addition in the Langdon Street National Register Historic District and adjacent to a designated landmark to construct a new fraternity house.

---

**Relevant Landmarks Ordinance sections:**

- 28.04(3)(n) Any development on a zoning lot adjoining a landmark or landmark site for which Plan Commission or Urban Design Commission review is required shall be reviewed by the Landmarks Commission to determine whether the proposed development is so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjoining landmark or landmark site. Landmark Commission review shall be advisory to the Plan Commission and the Urban Design Commission.
- 28.12(12)(c)1.d. The Plan Commission shall consider the report of the City’s historic preservation planner regarding the historic value of the property as well as any report submitted by the Landmarks Commission.

---

**Background Information:**

The Langdon neighborhood has a distinctive character that is based on the development pattern of the area and the architectural trends of the time. The Langdon neighborhood was originally part of the Mansion Hill neighborhood and was home to prominent businessmen and University faculty. As the University population grew, the Langdon area became a popular neighborhood for Greek letter societies and housing for students. These Greek letter societies established chapter houses in existing stately structures or constructed new high-style period revival buildings. With significant growth in University enrollment, the neighborhood transitioned from a prestigious neighborhood of professionals to a student enclave that is known for its buildings of high-style period revival architectural styles.

The building at 210 Langdon Street was constructed in 1875 during the early phase of development in the Langdon area as the Congregational Church Parsonage. The building later served as the home of A.L. Sanborn, an Attorney and US District Judge from 1894-1919. As the neighborhood became oriented toward student housing and Greek letter societies, the building was largely remodeled in 1927 by Frank Riley for the Delta Sigma Phi Fraternity house. It is believed that this remodeling included the regularization of the undulating original floor plan perimeter and the addition of a full third story. The building was used by Phi Sigma Sigma Sorority from 1933-1937, as a men’s boarding house from 1937-1949 and became the Theta Chi Fraternity House in 1949.

The front portion was constructed in 1964 and is considered a non-contributing structure in the Historic District.

The building's chronology spans the early development phase and the change to a student enclave and "Greek Row" associated with University growth.

Plans and programs including the Langdon Street National Register Historic District, the Downtown Plan and the 2006 Comprehensive Plan have been put in place to protect the context and character of the Langdon neighborhood.

The Langdon Neighborhood National Historic District was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1986. The nomination form is linked to Legistar. The National Register nomination states, *"The Greek letter societies along with landlords and developers cashing in on the demand for student housing, demolished or altered most of the older buildings in the district. But, they also erected some distinctive high-style replacements, executed in the latest period revival architectural styles by some of Madison's best architects. This new construction of Tudor, Georgian, Colonial and Mediterranean revival buildings, alongside the older styles, resulted in an eclectic mix of buildings which distinguishes the Langdon Street historic district from any other area in the city."*

The statement above suggests that the buildings built during the period of historic development, between 1900 and 1930, are significant to each other and to the overall character of the neighborhood. While the specific building proposed for demolition has individual historic value due to the significance of the architect, architectural style, and early development history, it is most valuable as part of the collection of buildings in the unique context of the Langdon neighborhood.

The recently adopted Downtown Plan features the Langdon area in Key 4: Maintaining Strong Neighborhoods and Districts and in Key 7: Build on Historic Resources. The historic preservation related objectives, recommendations, and discussion points that relate to this proposal have not been provided for this Staff Report, but include pages 56, 57, 92 and 93 of the draft plan. Excerpts of the 2006 Comprehensive Plan that relate to historic preservation issues have not been provided in this Staff Report, but include Objectives 34, 40, 41, 42, 44, and 51. It should be noted that Staff believes the proposal is largely in compliance with the preservation-related issues in the Downtown Plan and the Comprehensive Plan.

The Landmarks Commission reviewed the demolition notices for 210 Langdon on October 15, 2012. At that time the Commission provided a recommendation to the Plan Commission that the building has historic value. The motion follows:

*A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Rummel, convey to the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission is opposed to the demolition of the rear portion of the structure for a number of reasons including the loss of a historic/contributing structure in a National Register Historic District in relation to the recommendations in the Downtown Plan, the structure's proximity to a local landmark, and the c. 1920s remodeling by master architect, Frank Riley. The motion passed by voice vote/other.*



Bing maps image

#### **Staff Comments and Recommendations:**

After the Landmarks Commission provided a recommendation on the demolition request on October 15, more information about this building has been revealed. A discussion about the preservation-related issues in response to this development proposal follows:

The National Register nomination determines that the rear portion of the building is contributing to the Historic District. Staff believes the building was found to be contributing because the original structure was a high style residential form that relates to the historic context and because the major alteration in 1927 was completed during the period of significance (1900-1930) and was designed by master architect Frank Riley. The noncontributing addition that was added to the front elevation in the 1960s masks the contributing structure from the streetscape. A concrete block stair tower was constructed on the rear elevation presumably in the 1960s which obscures the rear of the original building. The 1927 alteration and the subsequent additions diminish the architectural integrity of the structure and its relationship with the historic context.

Staff had the opportunity to tour this building with architect, Randy Bruce, and preservation architect, Charles Quagliana. Staff noted the conditions that are documented in the attached letters from Mr. Quagliana and structural engineer Kurt Straus. Mr. Quagliana states that "the architectural integrity of the property is very low" and Mr. Straus states that "there are significant structural issues present".

Given the compromised nature of this building, Staff suggests that while the building has historic value the Landmarks Commission should soften the previous motion regarding demolition given the new information.

The proposed building is similar in mass and scale to the building that is being removed and to other buildings within the context. The form and architectural treatment is compatible with the character of the neighborhood and respectful of the adjacent landmark. Staff recommends that the Landmarks Commission advise the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission that the proposed building is not so large or visually intrusive that it adversely affects the historic character and integrity of the adjacent landmark.

Staff finds that some architectural details could be modified to enhance a historically appropriate architectural character. In addition, Staff requests that modern interpretations of traditional styles in historic neighborhoods should have details that are based on traditional construction methods. While outside of the purview of the formal Landmarks Commission review, the following design suggestions could be forwarded to the Urban Design Commission so the concerns of the Landmarks Commission can be understood:

1. Use brick instead of stone. Staff is concerned that the proposed stone is too similar to the stone of the adjacent landmark.
2. Simplify the use of the segmental arch. Historically appropriate buildings typically have the same radius for all segmental arches on a façade. While the proposed building is a modern interpretation of a traditional style, the use of the arch should be simplified and used to denote a hierarchy of the elevation. Staff suggests that the same arch (height and width) be used at three places on the front elevation and that the other fenestration be changed to flat wood heads as used on the fenestration on the side and rear elevations.
3. Make the chimney masonry. Historically appropriate buildings have masonry chimneys.
4. Revise the lintels. In traditional construction methods, the lintel or header actually supported the load of the wall above and would extend 4 - 8 inches past the jamb of the window or door.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: January 23, 2013

TITLE: 210 Langdon Street – PUD-GDP-SIP for  
the Construction of a New Fraternity  
House. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ald. Dist. (28428)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: January 23, 2013

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, Tom DeChant, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Cliff Goodhart, Melissa Huggins and Dawn O’Kroley.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of January 23, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-GDP-SIP located at 210 Langdon Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Randy Bruce, Knothe & Bruce Architects, LLC. Bruce presented the site plan, showing some flexibility with the fire access with the double loaded parking bay. Landscaping has been added at the sidewalk with increased landscaping along the edge. They have removed the invasive planting species and added new trees. Wood heads on the windows have been stretched out for a more significant bearing angle and make them a stronger element. Light colored windows have been replaced with darker windows. A photographic sample of the stone was shown; the dormer will be green.

Comments and questions by the Commission were as follows:

- The landscape plan doesn’t do justice to what you’ve got going on here. The Maple in front isn’t a very tall growing tree. Try Hybrid Elms or Hybrid Oaks, something that has substantial scale. The Carpinus in the back should be replaced also. The elements don’t play with the architecture; it needs to be refined.
- You’re in one of the most precious historic districts of the City. I think the details need one more level of refinement. Thoughts like the concrete walk, creating a band in the stone. We’re transition from concrete to a piece of stone (precast), some of those details how the modern materials are now being used in this more traditional style.
- Showing the two porches as equal detracts from your main entry.
- This is a phenomenal environment you’re working in and it deserves a higher level of detailing.
- EIFS sills concern me.
  - If we were to use stone it would have to be hung off the wood structure behind it and now we’ve got multiple materials that we have to integrate. From a building science perspective I think we’re much better off with one material. I understand the concern over EIFS in general, particularly in sills, so we’ve talked about using the reinforcing mesh on the sills to give it a much higher degree of durability. It can conform to the shape we need so there is some benefit.

You can't get that crispness with EIFS, those sharp lines. They do pretty amazing things with PVC and other materials that have a real crisp line to them. It just looks really crude when you try to do sharp details.

- The dark green is a better complement to the building.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion stated that the two "arms" out front could be equal or unequal, the packets should be updated to reflect the project as presented, and the landscaping plan can return to staff to address Harrington's comments. In addition, eliminate the black diamond for metal edging, provide additional architectural detailing and refinement in address of Amy Scanlon's comments and provide an alternative to the EIFS sills and lintels, including consideration of other synthetic alternative materials in addition to stone, etc. Resolve details with staff relevant to construction materials and the appropriateness to a historic district. Further discussion stated that there are details that need to be resolved and enhanced, and it is not the Commission's role to say "move the porch back a foot or two;" it's the overall design concept.

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 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 210 Langdon Street

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

General Comments:

- Appropriate historic details important.
- Details, especially window and porch, could still be improved. Prefer darker EIFS color with dark windows.
- Overall good building, except for use of EIFS on window sills/lintels. Resolve design details of structure and materials.



City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** January 9, 2013

**TITLE:** 210 Langdon Street – PUD-GDP-SIP for  
the Construction of a New Fraternity  
House. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ald. Dist. (28428)      **REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** January 9, 2013

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Henry Lufler, Melissa Huggins, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Cliff Goodhart and Marsha Rummel.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of January 9, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the site plan and building massing only of a PUD-GDP-SIP for the construction of a new fraternity house located at 210 Langdon Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was J. Randy Bruce, the project architect. Bruce presented context photos and discussed the Landmarks Commission review of the project; the building is not of a mass and scale that is overpowering for the adjacent building. In addition, they had four architectural suggestions. A sidewalk has been added along Lakelawn and the parking has been reduced which also accommodates more landscaping with more of a buffer on the east and west property lines. He is trying to work out arrangements with the Fire Department as to whether parking will be single-loaded or double-loaded. Some of the mass has been reduced and some detailing has been eliminated to simplify the design of the building. The arched openings have been either eliminated or reduced in size on the front elevation. A horizontal tie to the building has been added that would wrap the building to help tie those elements together. Heavy window timberhead with a cantered cut to it would have a bearing dimension on either side; with an architectural head built-out as part of the stucco or EIFS system. The window sills would be the same material with mesh on those sills that makes them durable at that location. They tried a couple of different options for building materials and feel they are better off using stone; the brick diminishes the perceived impact. The building will be in front of the adjacent building next door but will have an approximately 40-foot setback from the street.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The porch entry seems heavy in stone. Have you considered other material? I like how the second story was simplified without all those piers.
  - No I haven’t. This is an area we’re not quite satisfied with yet but I haven’t looked at taking that stone to something else.

It feels like you’re using the stone to complement the building next door but on the other hand it really doesn’t complement; I wonder if it’s falsely competing and not helping.

We're not really trying to complement the building next door. There is a lot of stone in the neighborhood and is predominant and appropriate. The owners want it to be appropriate to this location while having a little bit of a "ski chalet" motif. We've given them a little bit of that with a lot of restraint.

- I like the treatment to the area above the balcony, it looks great and puts the attention back on the main entry. I'm tempted to say "let's see something that would look more like the wood around the windows." The main entry starts to look more like a porch and less active like a fraternity would be. I think the top of the entry needs more detailing; not more stone to relate to the doorway.
- I'd like to see the bike/moped parking get shoved to the top by about 4-feet so you have 4 more feet of planting along the edge because it would still sit back behind the two stalls that are there. It's an invitation to park a car in there.
- No vinyl edging, and the hedge on the top of the page along the parking, they show Spirea and it should be something more substantial if it's a hedge. The grasses on the downside of the parking lot, that's fine but should be a little tighter space and ornamental grass becomes more substantial than the Spirea because of the height. If a heavier shrub is not possible go with ornamental grasses rather than Spirea.
- I would look again at staff's comments, especially about the arched windows when you look at the perspective from the right. By keeping the smaller openings arched they don't really relate to the side perspective; look again at the front elevation.
- Some of the detailing with EIFS is going to feel like a larger, less expensive replica of something historic so look a bit more in trying to have accuracy in some of the details or some depth in some of the details. The EIFS still concerns me; they're going to get dirty and dirt will stick on them. Details like that will make the building look run-down.

- There are a number of stucco buildings in the neighborhood.

But using it for window trim doesn't strike me as the same genre of academic buildings.

- Something about the wood header sits funny to me. I don't know if it's not extended far enough to give the perception of bearing the weight from above, or if it's because they're cut inwards versus outward when you would traditionally anticipate them to be cut outwards to catch more weight at the top and bring it down. They feel less stable to me.
  - We saw this detail on an older building and thought it was pretty slick. I think our problem is the top part of this is maybe at the edge of the window; we just have to get a little bit more bearing on it.
- Are you using applied muttons? I would just avoid using the applied mutton altogether; just a new double-hung, modern window.
  - I'm totally fine with that.

I would strive for as deep a profile as possible on windows.

- There's something about bringing that porch further forward that feels a little awkward. Something about how it integrates back in is a challenge.
  - We can take a look at different materials and details for this.
- The shed roof dormer seems unusual for this district.
  - We've got that situation that occurs in a couple of places in here. We could look at flattening that roof out just a little bit to reduce the size of it some.

Maybe tying it down with the first and second floors will make it more integrated.

- The body of the house beyond the green is fighting with the mass of that porch and I wonder if the railings would help bring them together, instead of making the stone so thick on top.
- A tree would give the entryway more prominence.
- I really appreciate you struggling to work out these details and trying to simplify things. When I look at this perspective I see this little sliver of a pilaster and a flat lentil. Those kind of details, as you simplify,

you can avoid some of these goofy little details that come up when you try to turn corners and where you have openings.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion provided for approval of the site plan and building massing only, and the following:

- Modify the porch to integrate with the house which may need to be modified in terms of mass, location and extent.
- Address of architectural comments made including staff comments by Scanlon.

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 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 210 Langdon Street

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

General Comments:

- Look at massing of porch and entryway. Handsome building that is good addition to the historic neighborhood.
- Good progress made on simplification of details.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 28, 2012
TITLE: 210 Langdon Street – PUD-GDP-SIP for the Deconstruction and Construction of a New Fraternity House. 2 <sup>nd</sup> Ald. Dist. (28428)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: November 28, 2012	ID NUMBER:

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, John Harrington, Melissa Huggins, Richard Slayton, Cliff Goodhart and Tom DeChant.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of November 28, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a PUD-GDP-SIP located at 210 Langdon Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was J. Randy Bruce, representing Rattle Building Corporation and Theta Chi Fraternity. There is an addition on the front of a historic building behind the subject property that was originally the parsonage for the church next door. Currently this is a fraternity in very bad disrepair. They are suggesting demolition of this structure and construction of a new more modern fraternity. The plans try to maintain the existing yard setback. Planning staff will be suggesting a front yard setback overlay of 20-feet. There are 5-foot setbacks on the side yard lot lines with a pedestrian access point from Langdon Street down to the lake. The floor plan for the project shows an entry vestibule with a main living room and stairs to the upper level bedrooms with shared bathrooms. A side deck is included, as well as a deck over the front entrance. Small kitchenettes are included on the upper floors. A dozen cars, 8 moped stalls and 8 bicycle stalls are being accommodated. Architecturally they are looking at a strong academic motif with a stone base with simulated stucco on the upper levels, including some heavy timber details on the windows. The Secretary distributed and discussed the Landmarks Commission's recommendations for this project, which include preservation of the rear portion of the building designed and altered by Frank Riley, architect in 1926.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Need to provide more context on adjacent existing development; especially along Lakelawn.
- Need to adjust parking at Lakelawn to provide greenspace at street, including eliminating two stalls to have more landscaping.
- Can you clarify what was remodeled by Frank Riley?
  - Just the rear portion. The interior has been significantly altered. Amy Scanlon has since been in the building and has a better appreciation for what the structure is. It is a structure that's truly beyond its years. It's a timber frame building.
- Ald. Maniaci noted this is a "one for one" in terms of building mass and capacity.

- We don't have the context of what is happening on Lakelawn.
- What are the conditions of the trees in back?
  - There are some trees along the property line that are invasive. I had an arborist take a look at the Oaks; one has a 50% cavity at the base so the owner's are going to take that down now. The other will probably not survive more construction; it's already had its root die back from the 60s construction.
- The academic architecture is certainly fine. I like the use of the study areas with the decks with the caveat that there is no beer bottle chucking from there.
- I think it's going in the right direction. I really appreciated the rendering because it really showed the neighboring building very realistically. I would encourage a little bit more restraint on the design of the southeast corner, with the fireplace and the trellis, compared to the strong gable next door. A little bit more pure form. It's got a quiet presence but a strong geometric form.
  - I question the context because it's the TKE House next door. How can we make, through their design, the TKE House look better?

I don't want to prescribe exactly what you should do.

Bruce remarked that Amy Scanlon has a little bit of hesitation of us using stone next to the stone building next door. We initially just liked the stone and weren't thinking so much about the competition of the building next door. She is suggesting brick.

You can't mix brick and keep the stone.

There are other buildings along the street that are brick.

There's probably stone next to stone too.

I don't have any objection to stone or brick.

- I'll read Dawn's comment: Her recollection of the property to the northeast shown in the background on the rendering is a gable end that feels pretty substantial as a pedestrian. That neighboring gable is dwarfed by the proposed gable roof form. Please show the adjacent flat roof structure to the west to understand the relationship to both neighbors, understanding they differ substantially. I question the appropriateness of emulating a historic style with less detail and articulation and question the durability of EIFS sills.
    - The whole exterior skin is one system so this is EIFS, the light piece is EIFS and the sill piece is EIFS as well.
- Maybe she's suggesting some masonry sills, eyebrows and headers. With EIFS you don't get that same attention to detail.
- Clearly whatever you can do to maximize the durability of the building would be well received.
    - Next time we could come with a streetscape elevation.
  - Some other sense of how the rest of the street rhythms work. It's a larger building than most.
    - It's a little deeper than the existing building but not a heck of a lot.
  - Help educate us and the public in terms of how scale works in this neighborhood.
  - It looks like miniature chimneys, maybe it's just this perspective. This looks like it's just not of this house. Otherwise I think the rest of it works really well.
  - A permanent grill might be a better option than allowing them to move one around. (Maniaci)
  - That projecting entryway seems to really compete with the building next door to it. Look at shifting it to the corner so you wouldn't have that competition. The other thing is that in this traditional academic architecture that sort of chimney doesn't seem to work.
  - I want to see more of what the back of the lot looks like; need rear façade treatment related to Lakelawn.
    - From a neighborhood perspective I have gotten comments that incorporating parking is probably a good thing for the neighborhood.

Surface lots are not though.

Any and all parking is a welcome thing to the residents of this neighborhood whether it's surface or not.  
(Maniaci)

- Provide a consistent line around building architecturally.

**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 5, 5 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 210 Langdon Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	6	5	-	-	-	6	7	5
	-	8	-	-	-	-	9	8
	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	5

General Comments:

- Too much going on at southeast corner. More design restraint, please.
- Too much detail – overdone. Overpowers frat to east, which is landmark. Tone it down.