

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: May 19, 2014
TITLE: 734 Williamson Street – Third Lake Ridge Historic District – Mixed Use Residential Redevelopment – 6 th Ald. District Contact: Jim Bower (34084)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: May 19, 2014	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

Jim Bower, representing Baldwin Development Group LLC, registering in support and wishing to speak. Bower gave a brief introduction of the project and the project issues. Bower explained the project is in line with many aspects of the BUILD plan including affordable housing, structured parking, and sustainability. The project is one-story over the height noted in the BUILD plan which has been driven by need to build additional tray of parking.

Thomas Miller, representing Kahler Slater Architects, registering in support and wishing to speak. Miller explained the primary components of the project. Miller explained that discussions with the neighborhood have altered the project. The building was reduced from 10 to 8 stories on the rear. The Williamson Street elevation was designed to be compatible with scale, massing, and rhythm of adjacent properties. Other elements designed to reduce overall mass. The design blends into the industrial fabric of north side of Williamson Street. The northern properties have a different character along Williamson Street compared to southern properties.

Miller explained overall design and massing. He provided volumetric calculations and described building volumes and how the project was designed to visually break down the massing.

Tom Bergamini, representing Baldwin Development Group, registering in support. Bergamini requested that we begin a dialogue about the project.

Lindsey Lee, registering in support and wishing to speak. Lee is a property owner and business owner in the 700 Block of Williamson Street. Lee explained that hardship of this existing site and that the project requires two layers of structured parking to deal with the current parking issues. The developers have to purchase property from neighboring site to accommodate project needs.

The mass will be hidden behind other volumes in the center of this block. The latest development project on Livingston Street provides a layer that is necessary in an urban environment.

Originally this design had four stories at the front of Williamson Street with nine stories at the back. Lee explained that he would have preferred four stories at the street, but five stories seem fine. Lee explained that this block can accommodate density.

Lee explained that the conversation should also include the quality of the design and materials of the development.

Rummel asked that Mike Soref of Marquette Neighborhood Association share comments.

Mike Soref, representing Marquette Neighborhood Association, registering neither in support nor opposition and available to answer questions. Soref explained that 8 stories does not comply with the BUILD plan and that Marquette Neighborhood Association has not taken a position on this version of the development. Soref explained that he is not certain that this latest version satisfies the Marquette Neighborhood Association comments. The developer has had numerous (10-15) meetings with the neighborhood.

The BUILD plan allows for two bonus stories that can be provided for projects that contain affordable housing, bike parking, solar amenities, structured parking, sustainable storm water solutions and exceptional design.

Marquette Neighborhood Association has not voted on whether this project meets those standards for extra stories.

McLean asked the development team to discuss going outside of BUILD 2 plan recommendations. Bower explained the way this project would merit the bonus stories and the need for an extra story above the BUILD plan recommendations on the rear portion of the building. Bower explained that other elements of the BUILD plan are met by this proposal. Bower explained how the adjacent property allows extra width to make the project successful. Bower noted the BUILD plan divides the block through the middle of the property into different allowable heights.

McLean asked if it would be possible to add another layer of parking underground.

Bergamini explained that it is not possible due to construction requirements of high water table and related financial implications.

Levitan requested clarification about the trays of parking and the height of the building.

Bergamini explained that this development must replace existing parking that serves the surrounding buildings before the project can even move forward.

Rummel explained that the development team has accommodated the neighborhood concerns along the process including:

- Reverse massing of rear U-shaped element.
- Parking issues.
- Reduce height at corner of Livingston Street by stepping down corner.
- Articulated massing into separate buildings.
- Infill project instead of demolition.
- Unique hybrid building that is in a historically commercial block.

Slattery explained that the material color change is a good design solution and helps to break down the massing. Slattery requested images showing more context and sight lines from across Williamson Street and other viewing points.

Bower explained the massing of the front of the building and how the neighboring property owner was involved in the use of property, the parking, and the improved design.

Rummel asked about design change of corner element.

Miller explained the need to hold the corner, but noted the team would look into her concerns.

Bergamini explained that the project is trying to reach 20% affordable housing and that this changes the economics of the project and drives the importance of the size of the floor plates.

Miller explained parapet differences in height and materials between the building elements.

McLean explained that the different treatment of the building massing is quite successful and requested some clarification of the design.

Miller described the massing of different elements and how Building 2 overlaps design vocabulary of Building 1.

McLean explained that the building next to the Olds Building is traditionally appropriate and asked if they would consider adding a stone coping to the parapet of the brick building.

Miller explained that they selected a contemporary approach with rhythm being similar to historic structure. The coping detail is a visual link that they did not find necessary due to height, massing, rhythm and scale.

McLean requested information about site landscaping. Miller explained they plan to borrow areas from the neighbor to get landscaping incorporated into the development plans. They are also looking for roof decks on Buildings 1, 5, and 3. The pool deck will also have greenery.

McLean explained that generally he likes the layout and was pleasantly surprised by the massing and overall design.

Slattery explained that the design allows the massing to be successfully broken down, but that the math of the large building cannot be ignored. Slattery also noted that this development site is much larger than other development sites.

Miller explained that visual compatibility is important to a successful design.

Rummel asked if solar studies had been completed.

Miller explained they had been analyzed in modeling software.

Levitan explained the Commissioners will want to see those studies at a future meeting.

James McFadden, registering in support and available to answer questions.

ACTION:

No action taken. The Commission received an Informational Presentation.