

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: March 20, 2013

TITLE: 304 West Washington Avenue –
Demolition and New Construction in the
UMX District for an Addition to an
Existing Office Building. 4th Ald. Dist.
(28617)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: March 20, 2013

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 20, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the demolition and new construction in the UMX District for an addition to an existing office building located at 304 West Washington Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project was Bill Montelbano, the project architect. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Dan Barker, Andrew Seidel, Pamela Keehn and Patrick Elliott. Registered and speaking in opposition was Richard Rathmann. Revisions to the project include shifting the cupola and attaching it to the four-story building; windows have been added to the cupola and third floor addition; flat roofs are shown to be consistent with other parts of the building; keeping the cornice and brackets of the original building, showing something of the history of the building including a combination of brick and stucco building materials in a portion that is consistent with the Downtown Design Guidelines with the stucco used primarily as a trim; the fascia, windows, railing, and fencing are shown in a copper color. The existing stucco will be painted to match the new stucco. Older elements of brick on the building will be painted to match the new brick. Landscaping modifications have been made to planting materials per the comments of the Urban Design Commission. It was noted that the Commission previously stated adding more windows could balance out the use of stucco. Lighting areas would include the service drive behind the building, a porch area and some ground lighting in the landscaped area.

Richard Rathmann spoke in opposition to the demolition and loss of an attractive building, noting the fact that members of the Freedom From Religion Foundation are atheists.

Comments by the Commission were as follows:

- The patina-esque copper color doesn't look like copper, I would recommend looking at another material.
- This is much more successful than what we saw last time.
- Need a lighting plan.

ACTION:

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0). The motion required that the lighting plan be submitted for staff review and approval.

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, 6, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 304 West Washington Avenue

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

General Comments:

- Loss of neat old 3-flat will be missed. Appreciate design improvements.
- Design has improved substantially from first submission.
- Nice rework of cupola, upper stories – awful green.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: February 20, 2013

TITLE: 304 West Washington Avenue –
Demolition and New Construction in the
UMX District for an Addition to an
Existing Office Building, 4th Ald. Dist.
(28617)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: February 20, 2013

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 20, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for demolition and new construction in the UMX District located at 304 West Washington Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Dan Barker, Annie Laurie Gaylor and Bill Montelbano. The Secretary noted that this project is in a zoning district requiring specific building materials of which these elevations do not represent as provided in the packet on this item; it is expected that the elevations and building materials will be changed to meet the zoning requirements prior to the project’s return to the Commission for initial and final approval. Montelbano noted that there are three different types of architecture going on at this site because of the additions over the years; the Commission had previously recommended that they simplify and go with the 1940s prairie architecture. They have taken some of the stucco off and it seems realistic they could expose the old stone.

Annie Laurie Gaylor spoke to their desire to preserve as much of the history of the building as possible, while updating and expanding the structure.

Dan Barker stated that the original Italianate building had a cupola up top and that space would give them the room they need for the library.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The proportion of glass strongly needs to be reversed against the portion of solid (Italianate component).
- The roofline of the Italianate still exists. I would strongly encourage you to look at the form allowing to remain and stepping back your addition. When you’re on the corner of West Washington you would see that Italianate; let the brackets do their job.
- Instead of cutting off the roof planes and putting on an addition, add a cupola to the top.

- Instead of trying to add on top of the Italianate, I would do it in a dialogue much more modern and make it a much larger cupola. In essence your entire floor is a cupola, rather than doing a "false" fourth floor with the cupola. The brackets that you're saving are what disturbs me the most.
- It seems like trying to combine the Italianate and the prairie isn't quite working.
- Everything new that you're putting on here is one expression and it could be a really modern expression of an addition on top. Not a hat on top of another hat on top of another hat (Italianate component).
- Two halves superimposed on something is not really Italianate.
- Staff noted that the design of the addition is what's at issue, not necessarily the cupola. The library could still be placed where you want it but the addition form on top should be different. They want a different, more contemporary design.
- The building's three components don't hold together, third story addition doesn't work.
- The historic elements that are important here are not being picked up on the outside. It is extremely important that these three buildings make a statement and hang together well, which they do not do currently. They can work together and be very powerful together. I would strongly suggest you take a good hard look at this site and think about what is best for this site from an urban context. There may be other ways to get your programming in there.
- Some of your selected plantings will take too long to reach their desired size. Lilly turf needs edging to control. Provide vines beneath the Maples; English Ivy or Winter creeper.
- Keep one Maple with other tree to be a bit larger, mid-level; e.g. Yellow Wood but OK as is, slow grower.
- Better images would really understand the design a lot better than elevations, need color, three dimensional images when project comes back.
- Maximize windows at 10' setback along lot line.

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, 6, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 304 West Washington Avenue

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

General Comments:

- Request cohesive expression of new elements/additions instead of copying 1850's style. Very nice solution. Please work to simplify Johnson St. elevation – west corner is successful.
- Enhance the prairie. Simplify.

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: December 19, 2012
TITLE: 304 West Washington Avenue – Demolition and New Construction in the UMX District for an Addition to an Existing Office Building. 4 th Ald. Dist. (28617)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: December 19, 2012	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 19, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on demolition and new construction located at 304 West Washington Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project was Bill Montelbano, project architect. Montelbano presented plans for the Freedom From Religion Foundation to expand their building to address their growth of over 300%. There is an existing 3-story masonry apartment building that they are in the process of acquiring. Because of the slope of Henry Street none of the floor levels line up and the set up of apartment buildings does not allow for the expansion of offices. The intent is to blend with the stucco materials and the Italianate style of architecture. An existing parking area will be changed to additional greenspace due to the new Zoning Code. Basic organization of the building is a mixture of office space with the fourth floor having a 100-occupancy hall. Once the addition is completed they would go back and do a third floor addition to the existing residence and add a cupola.

Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- I wonder if it’s time to say goodbye to the Italianate design elements as proposed with the addition.
- Instead of introducing a third style, maybe wrap it with the prairie style as with existing front addition.
- I strongly agree, I like the prairie piece best and I would go to a simpler vocabulary that uses more of the prairie. I do not like the addition of the Italianate in general. Bumping it up is not good.
- With such large neighbors, think of your addition as a larger mass to hold its own on that corner. It doesn’t have to be as tall, but look at it as a larger composition.
- You’ve investigated to be sure that the existing building can’t be retrofitted for your use?
 - It would be very difficult. It’s got interior bearing walls, it’s already too close to the property line, none of the floor levels match up, it would be tough.
- Don’t bump up Italianate with addition and no need to preserve brackets.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

The Commission generally felt that the addition should not reproduce the "Italianate" style but emulate the "Prairie" style of the front addition, redo the Italianate portion of the building to be wrapped in a prairie style between the existing front addition and redesigned new addition per the comments.

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 4, 5 and 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 304 West Washington Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	4	-	-	-	-	9	5
	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	4	-	-	-	-	6	4
	-	5	-	-	-	-	5	5

General Comments:

- Say goodbye to Italianate and go for the prairie wrap.
- Too many design vocabularies in very tight site. Simplify.
- Different mix of architectural styles.

Mifflin West District, CNI Steering Committee Meeting

Capitol Lakes Private Dining Room, 333 W Main St.

Tuesday, January 8, 2013

Members present: Scott Kolar, Rick Broughman, Tim Kamps, Dan Bohl, Pete Ostlind

Guests: Peggy LeMahieu, Jeffrey Wills, Dan Breunig, Jeff Ripp, Alder Mike Verveer, Kevin Firchow, City of Madison Planning Division

Meeting start 4:30pm, Meeting end: 6:25pm

304 W Washington Ave.

Development Team: Bill Montelbano, architect, Andrew Seidel, FFRF, Patrick Elliot, FFRF

Bill Montelbano presented changes as a result of their presentation to the Urban Design Commission (UDC). The Freedom From Religion Foundation owns the 3000 square foot property. They want to expand by purchasing the neighboring property at 10 N Henry Street, razing the existing 3 story apartment house, and add a 4 story addition joining their original building. The original building, dating from 1850, is in the Italianate style with a 1940's Prairie Style addition. The concept presented to the UDC included a restoration of a full third floor and cupola on the Italianate section and the design of the new addition fusing elements of Italianate and Prairie Style. At the UDC meeting, members expressed a strong preference for the Prairie Style for the new addition. Montelbano had made updates based on that input for presentation to the steering committee. However, he stated that he had heard from UCD staff representative Al Martin earlier that afternoon with further input from the UDC. They desired a uniform style for the entire proposal and their preference was Prairie Style. Montelbano stated he had not had a chance to contact the owners, as they were out of town, but he believed they would want to preserve the Italianate section. Steering Committee members discussed this issue and came to a consensus to support the FFRF if they chose retain the Italianate section. This was based on the fact that the setbacks of the different building sections and proposed landscaping elements would provide sufficient definition of the sections to make them appear as different buildings. It was noted that there are multiple examples of this effect in the downtown area. It was also noted that the Downtown Plan supports preserving existing building styles. Also a concern was expressed that it could impose an unnecessary cost burden on the owners.

Stouder, Heather

From: Richard Rathmann [rfrathmann@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 27, 2013 3:03 AM
To: Stouder, Heather
Cc: Verveer, Mike; Jonathan Makool; Jeff Aue; mgspayne@tds.net; Amado Rodriguez; J Martin; Richard Rathmann
Subject: Stop FFRF Expansion

Greetings, Heather Stouder:

Either Scott Kolar or Davy Mayer referred me to you.

I am trying to help stop the demolition of the old house at 10/12 N. Henry St. by the Freedom from Religion Foundation (FFRF). What is our probability of stopping it? At government meetings I have seldom felt that I live in a democracy. And now once again Scott Kolar tells me that important decisions on this case had already been decided before I even had access to the necessary information that these decisions were being made. Of course I feel foolish, humiliated, and powerless due to this. We picketers have been making signs and calls, picketing, writing letters, and practicing speeches as soon as we heard about FFRF's application. I have picketed about 12 times already in the cold, wind, and wetness.

So could you please pass this e-mail on to the websites of the Planning Commission and the Urban Development Commission? I request them to take into consideration our considerable effort while lacking the vast majority of the information necessary for real informed choice?

In the future how can citizens become informed well ahead of time about their deepest concerns of government decisions, before it is too late?

Thank you very much indeed!

Richard Rathmann
333 W. Dayton St., Apt. 704
Madison, WI 53703

608-257-8869