

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: July 31, 2019

TITLE: Accepting the Final Report and
Recommendations from the Urban Forestry
Task Force. (55206)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 31, 2019

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Rafeeq Asad, Tom DeChant, Cliff Goodhart, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr and Shane Bernau.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 31, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **ACCEPTED** the report of the Urban Forestry Task Force. Registered in support of the project were Dan McAuliffe and Marla Eddy, representing the City of Madison. Registered neither in support nor opposition was Denise DeMarb. The Urban Forestry Task Force was formed in 2017 to look at the City’s policies and operations related to forestry and ways to increase our urban canopy. One of the recommendations of the report targets removal of tree species from the Urban Design Districts ordinances and grant that to the City Forester. The primary rationale is that City Forester is best equipped to adjust tree species over time as different species threats come into play, such as Dutch Elm disease and Emerald Ash borer. The City also wants to diversify the types of trees that are planted throughout the City. A canopy that is contained with very specific species will be more vulnerable to those threats. The task force also looked at trees on private property, in the right-of-way and on public property (parks and stormwater areas). The document contains recommendations relative to each of those. They suggest revisiting through Zoning the setbacks for development where currently there may not be enough space to plant trees. There are many parking areas throughout the City that have very few trees; it’s time to look at the triggers that require, through the Zoning Code, the addition of landscaping and trees in parking areas. Currently staging for developments often occurs in the terrace and sidewalk area, where a developer may remove a mature tree, but is only required to replace it with a new tree that isn’t mature. This looks at ways to encourage the preservation of those street trees by making their removal more costly to developers. It may not result in preserving some street trees but it gives a better opportunity for requiring new trees under better circumstances.

Public Comment:

Denise DeMarb spoke as a member of the Sustainable Madison Committee and former Alder. She asked the Commission to pay attention to the levels of phosphorous and recommend that City Forestry look at that when selecting trees for our canopy, as levels of phosphorous vary from different species of trees. Secondly not all trees emit the same amount of pollen, we should be looking at trees with lower pollen levels to alleviate health issues.

The Commission discussed the following:

- When we see landscape plans there are often tree species on them. Are you saying we shouldn't make judgment on those and leave them to the Forester? Are you going to review those landscape plans then before they reach our table?
 - Our recommendation would be to maintain UDC's purview of canopy versus ornamental, but remove the specific species from being a requirement.
 - If we look at it from the standpoint of making a list that would be supported, there are still Ash trees listed in the ordinances. If there's an approved list it doesn't necessarily need to be codified, but these are acceptable species to add to the landscape. Maybe there's an approved list but not identified specifically in the ordinance.
- We see landscape plans, which have trees. Either we're going to approve that plan or we're going to say we can't approve this because the City Forester hasn't vetted it.
 - We're not talking about the landscape plan itself, but the acceptable species.
- We're talking about trees in the right-of-way?
 - For instance, the hotel just came in with trees shown. Right now it says Ash trees are acceptable.
 - We're trying to consolidate lists. It was our belief that the City Forester is the best person to be mindful of the threats to avoid and diversity we're trying to achieve. Simplifying these lists into one would benefit that goal. Zoning would probably be the ones making sure the trees are the right species.
 - For example today I met with the DNR, who is working with the U.S. Forest Service. They are doing random plot samples through our metropolitan area, those will identify what species are on private property, data will be coming to us about the size of those trees, light cover, what type of species is predominant on private property. When we look at that urban forest, 85% of that is predominantly on private property, so how do we make sure we have diversification?
- I agree but I think that's a very slippery slope once we start controlling plant selection on private property. Public right-of-way is one thing.
 - You already have the list.
 - What we would effectively be doing is removing the current list (that is in the Urban Design District ordinance).
- There's an efficiency of process here, it's a flawed list but it's also nice to have a go-to reference. A single accurate approved list would be helpful as a reference guide. There are other things in here that are really great, the root volume, Page 19 number 9 I struggle with a lot, but it's absolutely necessary. On page 18 number 4, that shouldn't qualify just size of tree but quality.
 - At this point the recommendations are a starting point for a team to dig in and figure out what ordinance changes need to happen in the future.
- I don't understand what role the landscape architects on this Commission would play.
 - If anything it wouldn't limit your species selection ability, I think it would have the City be more nimble to react to threats as they occur. Our goal is to expand that list and have the Forester take charge of that. The goal is to remove the list from specific ordinances.
- Right now we have a list of suggested species but they're not in the Urban Design District ordinances.
 - When we create the list it's much easier to monitor disease and adapt to those things when we find another infestation that we want to stop in its tracks.
- Could the UDC be advisory to the updated list? Because it's going to change.
 - Sure.
- We have some very qualified and competent landscape architects that really shape the projects we approve. I don't want to back into a corner how they help these projects be successful.
 - You already have a list, but you're limited.

- By removal of your list your options would be expanded.
- It would give the developers less confusion as well.
- (Secretary) This is UDD No. 1, the first district created over 20 years ago. This list exists in UDD No. 1, it does include Ash trees and other trees we don't plant anymore. They don't want to take away any authority from the Commission, but simply take this out of the ordinance and clean up these districts.
 - That list is very limited. When you talk about limiting the authorities of this committee, it's already doing that. We review the list annually.
- We only have the report in front of us, not the resolution. We can only make a recommendation on the report. If we want to act on that resolution we would have to notice it for another meeting. We can have a motion to accept this report. The Legistar number actually references a City Council draft resolution, we didn't post it on our agenda that way so under open meeting laws I don't think we could vote on a resolution. That was what Denise was speaking to.
- If all the individual tree lists are removed, could they all simply reference the most current list from the City Forester?
 - Yes that's our intent.
- On page 25 item 13, there were certain places where the public lands along the lakes will be in the viewshed of homeowners. I have some concerns of the blanket statement that no one can protest if you say plant a tree there. If it happens to be in the viewshed and I'm one of those homeowners, I would object and I would expect to be heard. I would remove that.
- Where is the diversification controlled?
 - We've discussed the nursery cycle. Landscape architects will look at what's available, the nursery will buy what sells. So we have this cycle of stocking the same trees because that's available and it's what sells. The Urban Tree Alliance does free planting of certain species that is intended to diversify our urban forest.
- If a project comes to us and says we're going to plant 100 of these and it's on the list, is there any oversight on that?
 - I would defer to your landscape architect.
 - All site plans require a stamp and approval of a landscape architect. Certainly we can't say that every landscape architect is going to follow that, but the goal was to raise the bar for those projects but trusting in the professionals that know best.
- How does it affect what we do here? And how does this utilize racial equity and social justice?
 - I don't know if it would change any of your operations as it is now. The areas in our City where we saw the most deficient canopy focus on larger commercial and employment area, as well as some lower income areas that have fewer street trees planted. The most cost-effective way to increase the canopy is simple to plant trees on people's property at no cost (the City's cost would be \$250/tree). Another goal is to eliminate the cost to the private property owner. Currently if a property owner wants a tree planted in the terrace where there wasn't one previously, that cost is assessed to the property owner. But if there had been a tree there that had died, the City would replace that for free. So we're looking at how to close that gap.
 - When you look at the canopy cover map, there are significant studies on what trees contribute to human physical well-being, but also mental health. UW-Madison just did a bicycle study during different times of the day, and what canopy cover gives you with that shading. We're looking at what other communities have done, how did they achieve that, what can we learn and come up with some best management practices so everybody has canopy for being successful. Everybody has that equal opportunity.
- I don't think planting a bunch of trees is going to move the needle on social justice. I like to think that beautiful buildings and trees can solve some of our social ills but I'm a little skeptical about that.

- You mentioned the Fire Department as decision making on landscape. How have you engaged the Fire Department in their resistance to planting trees in a more dense area versus what they can veto for aerial access?
 - We had Bill Sullivan come to our committee to understand the International Fire Code.
 - What I recall that discussion was particularly related to street trees. Our typical spacing was not necessarily problematic from a fire perspective. We talk about how challenging street trees are in urban areas, not only above but what's below too.
- My concern is the developer saying “the Fire Department says no.”
 - We have identified some narrow upright species. We've been able to find some species that they seem to be OK working with that won't affect their access.
- These trees may get 10-feet wide at best. It would be nice to have a more dense canopy downtown.
 - It's tough, it's competition for space.
- How about the City following the example, this is a newly renovated building but I don't see any trees.
- We were told that the Historical Society prohibited it because this historic building didn't have any trees.
 - You're right, we do need to lead by example.
- On page 18 you talk about the tree management plan for development projects. That's something we could start asking those very questions of any development that comes in here. We want to know if you did an inventory, a construction plan.
 - The inventory is already required by Zoning, of what's on site and identifying what's to be removed and what can be saved, but we're looking at how to beef that up.
- Developers don't pay much attention to that. They come in with footprints that prohibit any new trees, I would much rather they go up than wide and cover the whole space with building.
- We lost a tree to street work. Public Works came in and just destroyed the root system of an Oak tree in our terrace. I would apply the same guidance to our public works team. It's not just the developers that are liable here.
 - Creating a place for all this information would be beneficial to all. There aren't many municipalities that have a tree technical manual.

ACTION:

On a motion by Bernau, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **ACCEPTED THE REPORT**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0).

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** July 31, 2019

TITLE: 9604 Wilrich Street – Alteration to a
Previously Approved Development,
Building #4 of Paragon Place. 9th Ald. Dist.
(56304) **REFERRED:**
REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: July 31, 2019 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Rafeeq Asad, Tom DeChant, Cliff Goodhart, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr and Shane Bernau.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 31, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of an alteration to an approved development located at 9604 Wilrich Street. Registered in support of the project were Ryan McMurtrie, Jon McMurtrie, Benjamin Chung, Tim Garland and John Cronin, all representing United Financial Group. The development team reviewed the Paragon Place site location and layout. They are requesting approval for an alteration for addition of units, going from a rectangular building to an L-shaped building. The community gardens will remain where they were originally proposed. They reviewed contextual information, building materials on the existing buildings and the proposed materials. They shared the proposed site plan, floor plans, elevations and perspective views. The architecture is improved from its original design. The 45 underground parking stalls give a 1:1 ratio with 42 surface stalls.

The Commission discussed the following:

- When I see a roof plan like that I wonder about its complexity, perhaps there's too much going on. The approved plans were not as urban as we would like, but they had some simplicity, restraint and order that this version does not have.
- The greenspace, is there any way to reduce that parking to increase the outdoor space?
 - We've discovered that as a function of how many 2-bedrooms are in the mix, we do need that additional parking. Our philosophy is to maximize greenspace but we realized they are necessary.
- I agree that it could use a little simplification in materials and shapes. I'm also wondering are there dryer vents or other penetrations on this façade that we're not seeing.
 - The magic packs are all concealed within the recesses of the balconies at a 90-degree angle to the façades. We would have to add the dryer vents to the renderings.
 - It's ducted through the floor trusses on the second floor, a 4'x4' vent and colored to match the brick. There was some concern about the complexity of the rooflines earlier.
 - We did adjust the rooflines, this building is synergistic with the other buildings.

- On the north elevation showing the garage, you don't put windows there which you did on the other side. I thought the windows were successful in making that seem less like a blank podium and more like a building. You have some sort of louver there.
 - The HVAC room is where the panel is but not the whole wall. We can look at that. My only concern is it being out of balance with vents.
- Can you shift the louver to align with the window?
 - We can look at off-setting the vent and incorporating additional windows.
- This was originally approved in 2015? Do you have the materials here?
 - Yes all five of the buildings and their materials were approved. This request entails modifying the final building. We do have the materials.
- That's a lot of materials, a lot of different materials. With the peaks of the roof, and the ins and outs, it is a little busy. None of the push/pulls are significant. It seems busy.
- Speaking to the planting design, kudos for your variety of different species, you're using stuff we don't typically see. Some of your numbers are really quite high.
 - It's our goal with the proper design, planting and management that these plants grow and live together, and bring the maintenance costs down.
- If there's room for mulch, there's room for a plant. It's a nice selection of plants. On Building 4 I see 576 English Ivy in there, that can't be right.
- The planting bed edges could be smoothed and simplified, just a little clean-up of the planting bed.
- What is getting planted for the playground and where does the public garden go?
 - The garden is here, we're still debating the location of the playground. The goal is this would be the heart of the amenities of this property. Long-term we're proposing some age-restricted housing and bring the components of the neighborhood together.
- Somebody should address the materials comment.
 - We believe they're very high quality materials that we've used to break up and provide vertical articulation. Your concern is the number of materials?
- The number and the complexity. It's busy. You can have a busy building in terms of push and pull, this roof is doing a lot. Sometimes less is more.
- Does the number of materials mimic the other three buildings?
 - Basically yes. This building has a slightly longer façade so we incorporated the additional color, as well as incorporating color from the other buildings. Do you want one brick in the recesses and one main field brick?

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Asad, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion provided for the following:

- Less materials, less complexity in the number of forms and geometries and the roof, a little more restraint to the building design.
- If there are any penetrations (dryer vents) show them on the elevations.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: July 31, 2019

TITLE: 2340 S. Winnebago Street – New Development of a 4-Story Mixed-Use Building Containing 38 Residential Units and 21,000 Square Feet of Commercial Space for Red Caboose Day Care. 6th Ald. Dist. (56728)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 31, 2019

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Rafeeq Asad, Tom DeChant, Cliff Goodhart, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr and Shane Bernau.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 31, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a mixed-use building located at 2340 S. Winnebago Street.

Registered in support of the project were Melissa Huggins and Megan Schuetz, representing Movin’ Out; and Kevin Burow, representing Knothe & Bruce Architects.

This is a joint development between Movin’ Out and Red Caboose Day Care, with the child care facility being on the first floor and affordable units above that prioritize affordable units for teachers and childcare workers. In addition, Movin’ Out tenants and Red Caboose will have shared spaces. Movin’ Out is a non-profit based out of Madison whose mission is focused on individuals with disabilities; creating affordable housing opportunities that are integrated to meet that mission. They have been in business about 25 years and doing multi-family projects for the last 12 years. The site is located on the southwest end of the Union Corners development and bounded by four streets. They have been successful in obtaining two additional properties to provide more density and parking within the confines of the property. The main entry is off Winnebago Street adjacent to the outdoor playground area. Vehicular access is off of Fifth Street and staff parking is accommodated off E. Washington Avenue directly into the underground parking. This is a 38-unit building with 53 parking stalls below. There is existing street parking along Winnebago Street and a drop-off space will be designated. As part of the housing development they are pursuing WHEDA tax credits, which requires 3-bedroom units that have direct access to the outside of the building, which allows them to achieve activated streets on both E. Washington and Sixth Street. The building is L-shaped and stepped back along E. Washington and Sixth Street to create a 3-4 story transition with an opportunity for larger outdoor patio spaces. There will be a fitness center and community room. Building materials proposed include a cast stone base element with cream colored brick and composite siding in a darker hue, and a red accent piece to create vibrancy. They have not started a concept landscape plan. There is discussion of adding solar to the roof of the building. Red Caboose is planning for future build-out of additional classroom space.

The Commission discussed the following:

- I see a wonderful photo of urban forestry on the east side but I see nary a tree.
- You're playing with two different options for the corner, one is open balconies and one is closed in.
 - Those are not balconies, that's a different façade. Those are opposite corners.
- That doesn't seem like enough parking for the daycare, considering how much drop-off and pick-up occurs.
 - We anticipate some people will park on the street. They have drop-off and pick-up at various times throughout the day. Red Caboose also has a philosophy that parents come in and spend a little time. The 7 stalls will be designated just for drop-off and pick-up.
- It seems like a tight area for cars to be coming and backing out. Is there a way to get an in and out traffic flow? Something that would feel a little safer.
 - We're running into our friends in Traffic Engineering. One of the first discussions with them is they will not allow us to have any access off of Winnebago. It's going to require some discipline, but I would encourage you to see how Red Caboose manages their parking now, successfully, and this will be much better.
- I appreciate the introduction of color. In the elevations it seems more balanced, but the perspective of the red feels off. It might be startling to have all that red reflectivity coming into the room. Maybe there's a more subtle way to add color that doesn't feel like you're wrapping a package.
 - The irony is that the Director likes this because it is like wrapping up a package. We've been working on this for a very long time.
 - We can look at scaling it down or adding some trim on the window heads, introduce more of a beige panel, but we would like to keep as much of it as we can.
- I do like the red but it needs to be well thought through.
- How did you choose this form and materials based on this context?
 - Given all the new development at Union Corners we're trying to be sort of unique in terms of material selection so we don't seem like an extension of that development. We feel these materials should hold its own presence and tie it together with the red accent. We're trying to keep the palette as simple as possible.
- That's good. I think you should explore how you treat your corners. Not in terms of materials but building form. You have this balcony but then a huge brick column that takes over. I agree with the red, some of the proportions just need to be adjusted a little bit. It's really close in color to the middle and then a thicker darker crown that doesn't seem quite right.
 - We can look at the overall massing.
- This could end up looking like a flimsy brick element, how that gets detailed is important. The entries could look more porch-like, a place for people to sit.
 - We can look at canopies over these elements to give a sense of space.
- Is the house on the corner occupied?
 - Yes it is.
- Have they seen this?
 - They have attended all our neighborhood meetings and are supportive. We've had preliminary conversations about the landscaping and how to make sure they have some privacy. That's why the parking is there rather than units.
- The stairs leading to entries don't look like residential at all. The backside is a lot more successful than the other side. I'm not sure if maybe the materials should come down.
 - We could look at that.

- Is there a way to give the porches some more privacy, maybe bring the brick around as defining part of the porch, like a low wall instead of the guardrail. It doesn't feel like somebody's private space.
 - They are going to have two exterior spaces, the second floor balcony as well as that first floor area. Our goal is to keep the first floor activated. They do have a separate interior entrance as well.
- I wonder if the red awning over the private entrances is also queuing it, almost like you're going to see signage out there. The red could be a clue to the public entrance.
- If you didn't have the red it would look like so many other buildings. The conversation about the red is a little subjective, given our Wisconsin weathers.

ACTION:

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

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: July 31, 2019

TITLE: 216 S. Pinckney Street – New 9-Story Mixed-Use Development above the 5-Story Parking Structure Podium at Block 88-Judge Doyle Square. 4th Ald. Dist. (56760)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 31, 2019

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Rafeeq Asad, Tom DeChant, Cliff Goodhart, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr and Shane Bernau.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 31, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a new mixed-use development located at 216 S. Pinckney Street. Registered in support of the project were Lee Christensen, Isaac Wallace, Jeremy Frommelt and James Worker, all representing Gebhardt/Iconica; and Michael Carter. Registered and speaking in opposition was John Jacobs.

The team presented plans for the top of the podium on Block 88 as part of Judge Doyle Square in response to an RFP. They are trying to meet sustainability features, maximize the tax base by maximizing the density of the building, provide workforce housing downtown and activate the space during the day as well as at night. Images show relation to the materials used on the Madison Municipal Building without repeating it. They have metal panel from the base to add to the upper levels, and added a curved element towards to the third level office space. The first floor space has two lobbies and two retail spaces still being coordinated. The fifth floor has 22,000 square feet of office space as well as common space to serve office people and residents. A typical floor plate has 25 units in a mix of studios, one-bedrooms, one-bedroom dens and two-bedrooms. The roof plan has some solar panels on the more south exposure and rain water collection to use at the bathrooms at the fifth floor office level. A solar study shows impacts on the surrounding buildings, most of the shadows fall on Pinckney Street. They are proposing Nichiha panel in a metallic look, an accent of Nichiha that looks like red cedar and faux grain for siding. They like the idea of a more organic color to add warmth to the downtown. Stone will be added to the base of the building. An updated view shows glass panels in lieu of masonry panels at the parking level. They hold the datum line with the feature walls in the center of their building as defined by the MMB.

Public Comment:

John Jacobs spoke to concerns regarding the height and the equipment that goes above the Capitol View Preservation Limits. It is an important aesthetic consideration. Those mechanicals are way too big. Block 89 is maxed out to the limit but they don't have mechanicals up there. The ordinance was passed in 1966, let's get back to letting everyone in Madison view that Capitol and follow the law.

(Commissioner Goodhart): In my experience the City vigorously enforces this. I agree with you, you're 100% right in your assessment of that in their violation of that. Only the elevator penthouse can go up. I don't see any reason to violate that, I don't know at this level if City staff is supporting that, I certainly won't be supporting that.

The Commission discussed the following:

- How much taller is this than the originally proposed building?
 - It's the same height. The building maxes out the Capitol View Preservation Limits.
- How does that relate to other large buildings around the immediate area.
 - It looks to be that the others are maximized as well.
- When you come back can you bring elevations to show how this relates to other buildings in the immediate area. There's not a lot of room for error. Is that a roof garden guardrail?
 - That's the original proposal. When we revised it we heard some comments about not having anything that exceeds that, so there are no railing that extend up above that whatsoever. The parapet actually screens the solar panels.
- But you still have guardrails on the far corner. The aesthetics of that are problematic.
- This is a huge contrast to what was there. This is simple and safe, which is not a bad thing. I feel like there are a couple of different versions here, you have some images that seem to be earlier versions. I like it a lot because it's modern, but simple. I don't know about the Capitol View thing, I'm sure you are aware of it.
 - My understanding is that we're complying with the ordinance.
 - We'll have to go through the same conditional use process but we've been told to stay within this box.
- I don't think we ever approved a building that exceeded those height limits.
- I wouldn't mind a bit less density.
- I'm concerned about the view overrun and that balcony sticking out, it looks odd and flimsy.
 - The intention was to relate to the rail on the MMB but we can look at bringing that in and make some adjustments.
- I think that's subjective too, there would be people that would love to sit in that spot.
- I think the top could use some finessing, it's got a lot of ins and outs. This warrants more special than that. Where I normally don't object to the wood look, this is very urban, in our core and you don't see those materials in these buildings. I don't mind the metallic and the stone, I'd like to see more of the stone or even fewer materials and more consistency with the definition of the balconies and the rhythm of the building as you go along. The ins and outs feel almost random. I would also pay attention to your mullion spacing. It's a nice size mass that almost has too much going on. There could be more of a consistent repetition to the façade. You could have something that is more refined and simpler.
- Part of it is the base is a smooth curve, then we've got rectangular cantilevered balconies and some angled balconies with pilasters. I know you inherited a lot of this and I'm sure it's a very difficult design problem, I really appreciate the order that you have brought to it. Maybe a little more sleekness.
- The prior building had elegance, this has no elegance to it. You're maximizing what you can put there but it's not doing that with any style. I also object to the use of fake wood material in the downtown area.
- I like that, once you start saying this building shouldn't have this material, it's what people like.
- You can get warmth without the fakeness.
- The scale of wood siding is not high rise apartment building.

- I kind of like the fake wood, but the appeal of it in a project this size is more the warmth and color. I'm not sure where anyone would be that they would pick up on it being fake wood other than the units right next to it. Other than that I don't have a problem with it, there's something to be said for the texture of it. On so many of these large projects, I drive across town and see all these high rises with balconies and there's never anybody on them, on the nicest most beautiful day, it doesn't seem to matter. I can't tell you how many times I don't see a single person up there, and yet these projects all emphasize the balconies. It's like a fireplace, everybody wants one but nobody actually builds a fire in them.
- I work downtown and have a view of balconies, I never even thought about it until you mentioned it, but I never see anyone on them either. You'll see abandoned furniture or bicycles.
- I'm always on my balcony.
- If Beitler is the developer of the rest of the project, is he going to come back with the same design for the other side?
- (Chair) That design was approved.
- Because there was a composition to Pinckney Street with that curve, and that's totally lost here. This doesn't address the curve other than extending it by one floor. I'm really concerned from a broader scale here, we're not going to get what we initially approved here. It doesn't read as elegantly as the original composition.
- Can you tell me about that walk/wash?
 - It's on the fifth floor, a fake turf area. It can be hosed out.
- To the balcony issue, the community room is the most used amenity. This rooftop garden space will be where everybody will enjoy the outdoors. In terms of the curve, how do you mimic that, it's a totally different developer. It was a composition but not anymore.
- A little more continuity. There are a lot of angles and sharp corners. I'll bet the building we previously approved never would have been built. To me the wood gets away from having that continuity. I don't understand the need to have that element, it's not an entrance to the apartment.
 - The intention of raising it in general is to respond to the datum lines. We're trying to do everything we can to take this base structure that's approved and make it work without seeming like we landed on top of it.
- I don't think your building relates to the MMB at all. It just strikes me as reminiscent of so many apartment buildings we see. I think the ones on E. Washington Avenue are better than this.
- Things are overworked a little bit. You could have a more minimal material change, just like the base has a rhythm it's very consistently around. You could really simplify it a lot but give it a rhythm that makes sense and then the materials make sense with that.

Is there a preference from changing the glass to stone where the parking garage entrance is located?

(Chair) The issue was trying to make that more pedestrian friendly, which we didn't get too far on. We pushed as far as we could, but they had designed the parking lot and poured the concrete before we even saw it.

ACTION:

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