

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** July 20, 2011

TITLE: 229 West Lakelawn Place –
PUD(GDP-SIP), Construction of a
Fourteen-Unit Apartment Building on
the Acacia House Property. 2nd Ald.
Dist. (22359)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 20, 2011

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Henry Lufler, John Harrington, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Todd Barnett, and Ald. Marsha Rummel.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 20, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 229 West Lakelawn Place. Appearing on behalf of the project was Josh Wilcox, representing Landgraf Construction. Appearing in support and available to answer questions were Mark Landgraf, Kevin Page, John Kothe, all representing Palladia, LLC; Chuck Possehl of the Bruce Company; Karl Roth, representing Landgraf Construction; and Alder Bridget Maniaci, District 2.

Staff noted that Ald. Maniaci was unable to stay until this item was under consideration but noted on her registration form her support for the project and her preference for the original limestone brick selection. She remarked that the gray clay brick is so dreary and unnecessary. She asks that the Commission approve the original brick material.

Wilcox noted the potential from changing the tower from CMU to brick; he presented two options, the original with limestone and the other with brick. Our stance on the brick versus CMU, we still like the CMU. We feel that it is a more monumental corner and it creates a more refined look that is more substantial and fitting with the neighborhood and we feel it scales out better. The limestone is a little more befitting to the neighborhood in terms of the horizontal piece we are comfortable with it both ways. He noted preference for the windows to go two over one from strictly functional standpoint with the hopper windows down below. In response to look at ways to mitigate the visual prominence of parking space between Acacia and the building; they have raised up the planter a little bit and revised the landscaping, we feel it will be a focal point as you are coming through combined with the green screen. Pervious paving has been provided in the two short term parking stalls. In response to a north stair on the north elevation, we feel that it doesn’t add any functional access to the building and doesn’t provide any better use of the tenant outdoor space. The only thing it does it creates a loitering and security risk. The green screen is one of two options for enclosing the bike parking area. The other option is a horizontal wood louver system. Another thing that has changed is that the horizontal and vertical elements on the west and east elevations have been modified to eliminate the metal for EIFS. Because it’s in a smaller area and the amount of metal that’s associated with 3, 4, 5 spots are primarily up off the ground. They are limited to

small areas between the windows where we are going to do it in a color that is used in other areas of the building. We'd like to do that at those locations. Following the presentation the Commission noted acceptance with the both the green screen or slatted options, going with the CMU in addition to the west elevation that has the four windows vs. the three with the thinner band. It was suggested that the applicant resolve the signage before you start construction so you don't have the issue of tacking the signage on. As an option on the north elevation it looks like you have four floors that are the same window heights; you might consider doing something different at that level of the upper level since the roof bends up, you may do something with a transom to go back to staff. But everything is great about the project but you've got solid, long term, durable, handsome materials, but to introduce the EIFS in those portions would be a mistake with the EIFS you have to go back and paint and caulk joints and it just seems a shame that 300 square feet of material should fall back on that as opposed to a nice metal product or even a darker brick with a lintel across. Slayton noted some changes from the landscaping standpoint based on some conversations with Chuck Possehl of the Bruce Company.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. With the new elevation. Barnett stated the thinner tower and longer base with CMU as originally presented. With option for the green wall vs. the screen wall, the lattice work across the bike parking area and no EIFS elements in the material pallet as it effects vertical/horizontal details of the east and west elevations, look at durable options like metal panel or darker brick with the final material selection to go back to staff for details as needed and appropriate come back to Commission. Encourage applicant to work out the signage prior to construction. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0).

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 6, 7, 7 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 229 West Lakelawn Place

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	7	7.5	6	-	-	7	8	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	6	7	6	-	-	6	7	6

General Comments:

- Nice project!
- Very good design. No EIFS please.
- Great work.