Department of Planning & Community & Economic Development
Planning Division
Katherine Cornwell, Director
Madison Municipal Building, Suite LL-100
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard
P.O. Box 2985
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2985
Phone: (608) 266-4635
Fax (608) 267-8739
www.cityofmadison.com

TO: Urban Design Commission

FROM: Katherine Cornwell, Director, on behalf of the Planning Division

DATE: 19 May 2015

SUBJECT: ID 36901 & 37589 – Approval of a demolition permit and conditional use to allow demolition of an existing two-story mixed-use building and construction of a new mixed-use building containing approximately 8,740 square feet of commercial space, 3,000 square feet of flex space, and 367 apartments at 510 University Avenue and 435 W. Gilman Street in the UMX (Urban Mixed-Use) zoning district.

The Hub II submittal pages 58, 60, 62, 64, and 68 illustrate the maximum development that may be achieved by gross interpretation of the Downtown Height and Stepback Maps. These maps limit height to 12 stories and require an upper story stepback of 15 feet at the 4th floor. The graphics provided by the applicant illustrate the absolute maximum that could theoretically be achieved; however, to say that this gross volume may be achieved "by right" is inaccurate. Only 4 stories and 20,000 SF is permitted "by right" on any given parcel in the Downtown.

Height greater than 4 stories and gross floor area in excess of 20,000 SF may be achieved only through **conditional use**. The applicant presumes that 12 stories on the site is a right because of the Downtown Height Map. However, the ability to achieve the maximum height allowed requires consideration of whether the new building is scaled consistent with its surroundings. The Downtown Plan places importance on topography, view corridors, the presence of historic resources, variety in building heights, and the scale of existing buildings in the vicinity in determining whether a new building may be constructed to the maximum height identified for a specific site or area. Staff and Commissions are required to consider what is the appropriate/achievable height and gross floor area based on interpretation of the purpose statements of the Downtown and Urban Districts - MGO Sec. 28.071(1)(a-f) and application of the Downtown Design Standards - MGO Sec. 28.071(3).

How to achieve a 12 story building within the W. Gilman St. context is of primary concern to staff. Staff have focused on building composition and articulation of the façade to reduce the perceived mass of volume of the structure. We believe the applicant has moved in the right direction, addressing many of the initial comments from staff and UDC.

Staff recommends that UDC consider the following questions and staff considerations concerning MGO Sec. 28.071(3)(c), as well as the Downtown Design Guidelines in the next round of project review:

1. Has the façade been sufficiently modulated, stepped back, and/or extended forward to achieve smaller vertical intervals?

a. Staff believes a more successful articulation of the vertical interval above the Smart Motors building would include the 2-story base, followed by a middle of 8-stories and a top of 2 stories. The 4-story top creates an awkward composition and heaviness at the top.

2. Have vertical divisions been sufficiently articulated using different textures, materials or colors of materials?
   a. The vertical division above the Smart Motors façade needs work. Beginning at the separation between floors 5 and 6, the building begins to lose the vertical divisions that serve to further articulate facade. These vertical divisions of floors 3-6 should be carried up through floor 8 with the additional stepback occurring above floor 8. Floors 3-12 should be clad in cream brick with other materials limited to the modern interpretation of the pilaster embellishments. The pilaster finial caps and parapet caps should use a material that is consistent or complementary in material and color to the caps on the original Smart Motors building. This treatment will give this façade a more unified, classic appearance.
   b. In the loading dock building, the white window surrounds are awkward, drawing too much attention that distracts from an otherwise visually interesting composition. Staff requests that the development team consider an alternate treatment, such as a more extruded surround in a dark metal, like the I-beams ganging the windows in the lower portion that create a more subtle and handsome relief in the façade. For the 3-window portion, consider the use of spandrel glass to create the appearance of a solid vertical window.

3. Are there sufficient variations in the rooflines to reinforce the modulation and vertical intervals?
   a. Height remains a concern given the recommendations in the Downtown Plan and the Downtown Design Guidelines (especially Architecture Design Guideline 1 – Massing). UDC should make very specific findings on why the height, mass and exterior treatment are appropriate, since their review will feed directly into the Plan Commission in a few weeks. Members of the Plan Commission will want specific direction from UDC why the whole project but especially the Gilman Street side is acceptable – why and how it meets the design standards and guidelines. If the UDC can clearly find that the height is acceptable, then staff recommends a configuration of the stories into a 2-story base, 8-story middle and 2-story to improve and appropriately balance the composition, giving deference to the historic façade that will become the base of the structure.

4. Does the architecture sufficiently consider massing, building components and visual interest per the Downtown Design Guidelines?
   a. The Fire Department has advised that the building code limits the number and size of wall openings on side and rear façades adjacent certain property lines. These limitations are apparent on the lifeless facades in some of the renderings. Specific resolution of this design issue should be provided prior to approval of the project to ensure that highly visible (blank) façades are sufficiently articulated. The use of vision glass in combination with a palette of materials should be used to address this concern; the use of spandrel or the avoidance of openings on this façade should not be considered.

      Alternately, staff encourages the applicant to consider a voluntary public art treatment of the blank facades. Though we do not have regulations or a 1% for the Arts program, etc., governing such a treatment option, if the applicant were willing this could be an opportunity to explore a demonstration project with oversight from the Public Art Administrator and the Madison Arts Commission. It could provide a way to brand the building in a hip and

culturally significant way that contributes to the Downtown's portfolio of public art. In this way we could turn a challenging architectural/code issue into an asset for the public's enjoyment that helps a private development standout in a context-sensitive manner. Should the applicant be amenable to this option, and UDC finds that it would be an appropriate way to create visual interest, then staff should work with the applicant and the Public Art Administrator to identify a path forward.

AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	**PRESENTED:** May 20, 2015
TITLE: 510 University Avenue – New 12+ Story Mixed-Use Project, "The Hub at Madison II" with 348 Apartment Units, Approximately 8,740 Square Feet of Retail and 2,992 Square Feet of Flex Space. 4th Ald. Dist. (36901)	**REFERRED:** **REREFERRED:** **REPORTED BACK:**
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	**ADOPTED:** **POF:**
DATED: May 20, 2015	**ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; John Harrington, Dawn O'Kroley, Richard Slayton, Cliff Goodhart and Tom DeChant.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 20, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a new 12+ story mixed-use project located at 510 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Brian Munson, representing Core Campus, LLC; Jeff Zelisko and Brad Mullins. The team did receive approval for demolition of the building from the Landmarks Commission at their meeting of May 11, 2015.

The new design reflects much of the input from City staff over the last several months, the adopted plans and the standards for a conditional use and the Downtown Design Guidelines. The team feels all the conditional use standards have been met by this design, most importantly the use and enjoyment of other property in the neighborhood. The Downtown Plan talks about the evolving character of this block of Gilman Street. They feel that the architectural changes made will create a building that will fit within the evolving context while also speaking to the context of what is around it today. The building is stepped back on Gorham Street to create a vibrant and exciting streetscape in an area which currently has none, while responding to an active streetscape by putting commercial and residential uses in close proximity. The final piece of the Downtown Design Guidelines which supports this development is the massing section itself, where it recommends considering the evolving context. The project is broken into three different forms so you have vertical articulation of the building, different treatments as you move around the building, while also transitioning so that when other buildings on the block are redeveloped they will fit in with taller structures.

The balcony elements have been lightened up in response to previous comments. Variation in the building's façades is tied together with a ring around the windows that ties above using a corrugated vertical system. A cast stone product in a complementary color to the brick is also being proposed to tie in with other design elements. Both vision and spandrel glass will be used. Munson stated that some of the comments received in the last minute memo from Planning staff are reflected in these updated plans. In terms of the articulation of the Gilman Street façade, they would like the UDC's feedback on that. The overall design steps back 15-feet above the existing façade going up to the top of the 8th floor, then stepping back an additional 5-feet, with a stepback

of 24-feet at the 11th floor. Looking at the Smart Motors façade stepping up, this works well. The four-story element recommendation from staff above the loading dock creates a vertical articulation up and down and rhythm of the street that goes from the 2-story to 4-story elements, as well as addressing some of the vertical articulation. The existing façade is 66-feet wide; the loading dock on the modern side is 33-feet wide. In terms of the variations of roofline, they feel the step backs incorporated on both the Gilman and University sides, as well as the comment about the balcony components really do create a nice, unique building form. In fitting with the Design Guidelines, this is an evolving block, an area intended as a transition from State Street over to the Johnson Bend district; both the changes made to articulate the Gilman façade, as well as the changes in architecture as you move around the building and step across the block really helps create a bridge between the two areas.

Jay Wendt, Principal Planner spoke to the Planning Division memo and how it can frame the conversation on how the Urban Design Commission carries this forward to the Plan Commission. The findings should show why this body feels the Downtown Design Guidelines, the Downtown Plan, height and massing, consideration of setbacks, etc. have all been met. The Downtown Height Map allows for a maximum of 12-stories in this area. The conditional use standards discuss how you achieve that 12-story height with stepbacks. Yes the maximum is 12-stories, but is 12-stories appropriate here, and have they achieved that in an appropriate fashion?

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- What objection would you have to taking that middle portion up another couple of stories and gaining more square footage?
    - One of the comments we got from Landmarks was the concern about more height, and that was expressed in the staff meeting.

  To me it's less the height than proportion. It's only stepping back a few feet.

  We would be open to that.

  We're not sure we all agree on that.

  We prefer it as it is, to be perfectly honest. We like that it brings the mass of the building just a little bit lower. We have taken the building down to 11-stories at the Gilman Street façade.
- I actually like the fact that the vertical divisions get narrower down to almost like a curtain wall look, I think that lightens the top. I see the staff recommendation is to continue that all the way up; I disagree, I think this is a better solution.
- This change in plane is so minor, why didn't this building take that corner and actually feel like a building with at least a 20-foot return?
    - We were really trying to make it play at the street to the existing building. We have had façades where we carried things across, but it seemed like it made the most sense with these proportions that we just let that break be right there. It sets back at least 5-feet.
- If you brought it up as recommended you would have more of a corner.
- I'm having a big problem with this building. I have biked up Gilman, I have walked up Gilman and we're creating an alley there. Gilman doesn't have the width to support Hub I and Hub II on both sides. For the context, it's not a very wide street. Go around to Johnson it works well, and I don't mind the Hub on one side, but not both. It's narrow and dark, very much like an alley.
- The Downtown Plan created all these expectations about height and density and this is a place where they thought it should be. In some ways this project has more step back opening up than most of the plans envisioned for this.
- Some of the comments about the scale of the taller building with the smaller buildings below, and this was the same comment in the discussion about Hub I; this verticality is further emphasized because you have the same windows stacked all day, and there's no playfulness or even subtly with some windows, subtly different to create an overall composition on an elevation, especially the large elevations that are

continuous all the way down to these lower street fronts (Gilman Street façade). If those had some more layering and composition within them they could be more successful. This level of "irregularity" at this scale is actually the one place where you could handle three simple bays that are regular and reinforce that street front, and where you need the playfulness and irregularity is on these large façades.

- That's where were butting up against Landmarks, where we want that historic treatment extended up.
- It can be, but these windows can be subtly different on one floor, like the project where they curved the brick back, by AnchorBank and the bays started to project, and it's very elegant.
- This problematic, blank façade is very dark in the renderings. Specifically what is actually glass or spandrel versus the metal?
- I like the proportions of the Gilman Street façade; I think a small top on that would seem strange.
- I'd like to see it both ways.
- On the curve, that massing is very comfortable, even the more acute views when you're driving through. That massing in the front kind of does break down some of that rigid verticality, and there's interest as it meets the sky; the other façades don't necessarily have that because they don't have those two elements, so if you could meet the sky more gracefully on the other elements (beyond the curve), not necessarily to this level of detail but overall conceptually.
- Your best contribution to the public on this project is the green roof on the two-story piece; that's going to be appreciated by every high rise surrounding this, so I would encourage you to have the biggest canopy trees and the most amount of greenspace versus pavers that you can.
- With respect to the walls and property line, this project has shown a lot more variety and imagination in treating those openings and even working with the Fire Department for some previously non-compliant solutions in negotiating to have as much vision glass as they possibly could.
- A building this big needs to be a collective decision, not just this Commission. There are some things we like, some things we don't know about yet. I'd like to see other bodies in the City have a chance to start wrestling with some of these as well. Initial approval will move this on to those Commissions.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (3-2) with Goodhart, DeChant and O'Kroley voting yes; Harrington and Slayton voting no.

The Urban Design Commission finds that the façade has been sufficiently modulated, stepped back and extended to create the vertical intervals that are appropriate. The vertical divisions have been sufficiently articulated using different materials. The loading dock area window surrounds in aluminum (silver) are appropriate. The Commission further finds that variations in the roofline reinforce the modulation and vertical intervals with the issue on how the other elevations meet the sky beyond the curve to be addressed, clarification of "blank façades" use of spandrel glass and metal, provide an alternative for the Gilman Street façade as was discussed that includes variation in window patterning. The motion also noted that the project as designed addressed the provisions of the Urban Mixed-Use (UMX) District in regards to the Downtown Height Map and the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines.

The motion provided specific address of staff's questions and considerations requested in the memo by Katherine Cornwell, Director, on behalf of the Planning Division dated May 19, 2015; and as stated by Chair Wagner, further articulated by Goodhart within the motion as follows:

1. Has the façade been sufficiently modulated, stepped back, and/or extended forward to achieve smaller vertical intervals?
    a. Staff believes a more successful articulation of the vertical interval above the Smart Motors building would include the 2-story base, followed by a middle of 8-stories and a top of 2 stories. The 4-story top creates an awkward composition and heaviness at the top.

        - Goodhart: With respect to the walls and the property line, I think that this project has shown a lot more variety and imagination in treating those openings and even working with the Fire Department for maybe some non code-complying issues to have as much vision glass as they possibly good. I see Hub I in the background, to me it's so much more successful than this. I want to make sure that in the long views you're showing us it does have that variety and playfulness that I think is lacking.

2. Have vertical divisions been sufficiently articulated using different textures, materials or colors of materials?
    a. The vertical division above the Smart Motors façade needs work. Beginning at the separation between floors 5 and 6, the building begins to lose the vertical divisions that serve to further articulate facade. These vertical divisions of floors 3-6 should be carried up through floor 8 with the additional stepback occurring above floor 8. Floors 3-12 should be clad in cream brick with other materials limited to the modern interpretation of the pilaster embellishments. The pilaster finial caps and parapet caps should use a material that is consistent or complementary in material and color to the caps on the original Smart Motors building. This treatment will give this façade a more unified, classic appearance.

        - I don't have strong feelings either way. It's appropriate.

    b. In the loading dock building, the white window surrounds are awkward, drawing too much attention that distracts from an otherwise visually interesting composition. Staff requests that the development team consider an alternate treatment, such as a more extruded surround in a dark metal, like the I-beams ganging the windows in the lower portion that create a more subtle and handsome relief in the façade. For the 3-window portion, consider the use of spandrel glass to create the appearance of a solid vertical window.

        - The material used in that area is acceptable. The silver color is fine.

3. Are there sufficient variations in the rooflines to reinforce the modulation and vertical intervals?
    a. Height remains a concern given the recommendations in the Downtown Plan and the Downtown Design Guidelines (especially Architecture Design Guideline 1 – Massing). UDC should make very specific findings on why the height, mass and exterior treatment are appropriate, since their review will feed directly into the Plan Commission in a few weeks. Members of the Plan Commission will want specific direction from UDC why the whole project but especially the Gilman Street side is acceptable – why and how it meets the design standards and guidelines. If the UDC can clearly find that the height is acceptable, then staff recommends a configuration of the stories into a 2-story base, 8-story middle and 2-story to improve and appropriately balance the composition, giving deference to the historic façade that will become the base of the structure.

There is quite a bit of variation in the rooflines to reinforce the modulation and vertical intervals. So while height is a concern there is quite a variety with address of comments made.

4. Does the architecture sufficiently consider massing, building components and visual interest per the Downtown Design Guidelines?
    a. The Fire Department has advised that the building code limits the number and size of wall openings on side and rear façades adjacent certain property lines. These limitations are apparent on the lifeless facades in some of the renderings. Specific resolution of this design issue should be provided prior to approval of the project to ensure that highly visible (blank) façades are sufficiently articulated. The use of vision glass in combination with a palette of materials should be used to address this concern; the use of spandrel or the avoidance of openings on this façade should not be considered.

        - Further detailing was articulated with the motion.

        Alternately, staff encourages the applicant to consider a voluntary public art treatment of the blank facades. Though we do not have regulations or a 1% for the Arts program, etc., governing such a treatment option, if the applicant were willing this could be an opportunity to explore a demonstration project with oversight from the Public Art Administrator and the Madison Arts Commission. It could provide a way to brand the building in a hip and culturally significant way that contributes to the Downtown's portfolio of public art. In this way we could turn a challenging architectural/code issue into an asset for the public's enjoyment that helps a private development standout in a context-sensitive manner. Should the applicant be amenable to this option, and UDC finds that it would be an appropriate way to create visual interest, then staff should work with the applicant and the Public Art Administrator to identify a path forward.

        - Agrees.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 510 University Avenue

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

General Comments:

- Too much mass/height on Gilman Street given Hub 1. Gilman is becoming an alley-like street; where is the sense of place?

AGENDA # 10

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	**PRESENTED:** May 6, 2015
TITLE: 510 University Avenue – New 12+ Story Mixed-Use Project, "The Hub at Madison II" with 348 Apartment Units, Approximately 8,740 Square Feet of Retail and 2,2992 Square Feet of Flex Space. 4th Ald. Dist. (36901)	**REFERRED:** **REREFERRED:** **REPORTED BACK:**
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	**ADOPTED:** **POF:**
DATED: May 6, 2015	**ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant, Richard Slayton and Sheri Carter.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 6, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a new 12+-story mixed-use project located at 510 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Brian Munson, representing Core Campus, LLC; and Brad Mullins. Registered and speaking neither in support nor opposition was John Morris, representing Cheba Hut.

The Landmarks Commission requested a referral of this item to allow them time to review the project and give input. Planning staff also has concerns with the project; they recommend this be a discussion with no formal action to be taken. Munson distributed updated packets directly in response to a meeting with City staff. They are asking for consideration for initial approval and feel they can address all the issues raised. In terms of the Landmarks Commission referral, this project was unique in that when this project first came to the Urban Design Commission the Landmarks Commission had already reviewed the notice and taken action and voted against removal of the building. The façade of that building has been designed into the façade of this new development. The site is identified for up to twelve stories in the State Street District of the Downtown Plan. Within the plan there is language to look at the evolving context of areas where the height is proposed to be above what is currently there and opportunities to look at address of the mass. Updated plans were shown based on Planning staff's review of the project.

Jay Wendt, Principal Planner discussed the concerns of the Planning Division regarding this project. How the building relates to the texture along Gilman Street, when you look at the existing rhythm, size and scale of buildings, how does this work and how do those stepbacks with the mass of the building achieve that. How do these relate to your cone of vision as a pedestrian? Staff is very concerned about that from a massing standpoint. From a composition standpoint, they've addressed that quite well. How does the historic building work with the texture? Building materials have been addressed in terms of breaking up the mass of the building. Staff is concerned about the Landmarks Commission referral and would like the Urban Design Commission to weigh in on that as well.

John Morris spoke of his concerns with the way the building curves over and impedes on their patio at Cheba Hut. Munson clarified that the 12-story portion of the building is pulled back from the corner so that it's really at the roof of the second floor is where it then comes up to meet the corner, which will be a masonry façade. The corner you can see through, that will be glass.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- What's the long-term future of the buildings on Gilman Street?
    - As it is right now this is not a historic district. The Downtown Plan would speak best to State Street and the greater area.
    - (Fruhling) This was talked about in the Downtown Plan. One of the things happening with State Street, even before the Downtown Plan was adopted, is to try to create the feel of a district around State Street, so it's not just the six blocks between the Square and the University. As we reconstructed State Street the next phases went out to those surrounding blocks: the streetscape, the street lights, the design treatment is all done with the intent of creating the feeling of a district for State Street. This is not a historic district but we are going to be revising plans for State Street, the Capitol Square and the surrounding areas that would include this area, but current adopted plans have it as part of the State Street District. The Zoning Code, including the Downtown Design Guidelines that need to be addressed with this project, codified and added more specific criteria that talks about new buildings fitting in with the existing context, walkable streetscapes and there is a section about massing with guidelines that really come into play here. The Urban Design Commission will need to weigh in on how well this project meets those guidelines.
- If they're not historic, I'm thinking of things like the Ovation where you had something designed to relate to State Street in terms of its height and massing. They came in with something that actually conformed to all of that.
    - This project does respond to the stepback maps that call for 15-feet after four-stories.
- (Parks) Yes the Downtown Height Map does identify that twelve stories may be possible on this site. However, any building that is taller than four stories and/or greater than 20,000 square feet in floor area is a conditional use which requires a subjective approval. If we didn't want there to be a discussion about the specific context of buildings taller than four stories we wouldn't have the requirement that you need to get a conditional use approval. These larger buildings, while they may be appropriate, they go through that approval process so we can have conversations like this about the context and where it's appropriate for height and where it's not. At no time during this discussion have we raised major concerns about what they're doing on the Gorham/University side of the building because when you look at that context that's perfectly appropriate. But coming in to this 2-4 story height on Gilman Street and you have a lot of intact character and it's not a designated historic resource, but it is still a collection of historic resources, there is still something special happening so when we add things to that context, they need to fit into it. We need to expand the discussion beyond just "the downtown map says 12 stories." Now that we have this somewhat unique referral from the Plan Commission to the Landmarks Commission by Alder Verveer's request, I think the Landmarks Commission is going to be looking at this perhaps through a different lens, and that's going to come back before you here for further conversation.
- (Secretary) The first time we saw this we talked about the team having to frame the presentation from beginning to end and address this criteria. Therefore the ability to do that more based on the changes we looked at today is much more enhanced because we need to make a finding that these criteria are being met. And they need to provide that case.

- It looks like you're doing your best to respond to the issues from the previous review. When we saw something that was a modern interpretation of a warehouse building compared to what we see today with all the subtle ins and outs, breaking down of scale and even how that 4-story portion relates to the brick building to the east, I think is really going to enhance that in a real positive way. I think it's a handsome composition along Gilman Street, the way the upper and lower façades relate to each other. The dark panel way up at the top, is it really going to be that black?
    - It's called "gun metal." But yes, the idea is that a good portion of it is that dark element and then there's a play with the other two gray colors. The intent is a very vibrant difference with the play in panels.
- Maybe those could even be expressed in a light gray, something to pop them out. Overall I think it's a huge improvement.
- The biggest concern I have is the canyon down Gilman.
    - I don't think we'll get that effect, there just isn't enough mass lined up against each other.
- Seeing how that other replacement buildings would actually work in light of the zoning we have adopted is something that should be modeled to help us understand how that street is not going to be a canyon if it's redeveloped, which you're starting to do. Need to model to see Gilman Street build-out based on future development anticipated with Zoning provisions, in conjunction with the development.
- I think having a porous façade is going to help because even though there's construction if seems like the sidewalk is narrow and buildings are very tight.
- Concern with dark metal at top; need to play with lighter gray alternatives, especially on exposed balconies.

ACTION:

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Carter, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-0).

No rankings were provided for this project.

THE HUB II ATTN. TIM PARKS

* 445 W. Gilman

* Zero lot line on 2 sides?

* 12 storys of Blank wall? any Detail Brick?

* IS Their a light/shadow study or model

* What is Fire dept. Ability to reach the court yard? If 445 Builds to lot line?

Rich Lofgren
347-0365