



**Agenda Item #:** 4

**Project Title:** 619 W Mifflin Street - New Multi-Family Residential Building in UMX Zoning. (District 4)

**Legistar File ID #:** 84855

**Members Present:** Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Shane Bernau, Marsha Rummel, Christian Harper, Rafeeq Asad, Jessica Klehr, Russell Knudson, and Wendy von Below

**Prepared By:** Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

## Summary

At its meeting of August 28, 2024, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a new multi-family residential building in UMX zoning located at 619 W Mifflin Street. Registered and speaking in support were Linda Irving, Samantha Farrell, and Burt Coffin. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Burt Coffin, Neil Reardon, Joseph Mayer, Jen Davel, Jesse Symynkywicz, Nathan Wautier, Phil Hees, Joia Wodarczyk, and Randall Alexander. Registered neither in support nor opposition was Linda Scott.

### Summary of Commission Discussion and Questions:

The Commission noted the project could do better relating to the surrounding context and asked the team to describe their approach.

The applicant reviewed the efforts that have been made to relate to the landmark buildings and sites, including maintaining the base mass, as well as integrating setbacks.

The Commission noted that the design needs color and texture. It seems like there are two masses with some hung balconies. There is not a lot of design or architecture being as loud as it could. For instance, the dark tower seems to have horizontal lines that are proud and gives it dimensions, but it doesn't look like they wrap the corners. You can celebrate the context without being background – you want it to hold its own weight. You just want to provide a little more interest. Seeing more about how the masses come together will be helpful.

The Commission inquired about the landscape plan, specifically the site and how it connects to its context. It is an odd back corner, and it is hard to fully connect to its context.

The applicant noted that while the street ends, the intent is to continue the street scape to the auto court with street trees and bike parking.

Overall, the Commission liked the treatment of the façade along the Wiedenback Building, but did have concerns related to how the building relates to the depot, especially the stepping in the masonry from three to two stories, as well as the masonry color. Consideration should be given to how is the brick relating on the proposed building, not how it relates to the surrounds.

The applicant noted that the brick color is preliminary and will be refined. Ultimately, the brick color was intentional to not match the depot, but did want to provide a color that is different because the two historic resources are different. The stepdown relates more to the transition to the Wiedenback Building.

The Commission discussed the pedestrian-oriented auto court, noting issues with buildings that need to serve people who do not have cars, but receive lots of deliveries.

The applicant reviewed the site plan and how vehicular and pedestrian movements will occur through the site.

The Commission confirmed the property line location.

The Commission inquired about the dark colors and the applicant noted that the intent was to break down the mass with color with the idea that they are two buildings.

The Commission inquired about building setbacks. The applicant clarified that there are varying setbacks around the buildings above the three-story podium.

The Commission noted that additional information would be needed that shows the changes in plane and a definite change in plane is necessary between the base and the tower.

The Commission inquired about where EIFS might be proposed. The applicant noted that it would be used on the internal courtyards only so that it is not visible from the public right-of-way.

The Commission inquired about the courtyards and whether a sun study was done to confirm how much sun they get. The applicant noted that the "East Courtyard" will get great sun, but the "Inner Courtyard" would not get as much sun – not a highly greened space, but plantings will be adjusted appropriately. It will be an amenity space, and will have additional lighting added as well.

The Commission inquired about the space between the Wiedenback Building and the proposed development noting that additional information should be provided in future submissions that shows that space between the two buildings, especially from the Wiedenback Building.

The Commission acknowledged that this is a difficult site. It doesn't have great street presence. There is a struggle with how you identify and connect with context. There needs to be connectivity to the depot. The next pass will need to have better connectivity to this side.

The Commission generally thought that the courtyards looked great and that they were excited about those, the chamfered corner overall was awkward noting that it may make more sense if the building just was notched out, and that lighting and safety will be essential to populating the space between the buildings.

The Commission generally agreed that the contextual relationship should be better maintained, including datum lines. The chamfer is a weak gesture – there are other things to look at – rotating a piece of the building at top. Really seeing the reveals in the building materials would be helpful; it almost looks like a super imposed grid, but it is not clear. It will be important to show those details. There is a glass corner above the base on the street side – explore using more glass.

The Commission requested that the applicant provide more views of the transition between the light and dark towers – what is happening there – encourage you to explore what happens in that notch area.

The Commission talked about the longer view from W Washington Avenue. This is the view that many will likely see more frequently. We need to start looking up at our designs as well. We are seeing less details at the top of buildings. Encourage the applicant to add more interest here. Looking at the chamfered corner – masonry color and contrast to the black balconies and the lighter panels – also the frames around the balcony doors. The truncate here is go bigger or do not do it. The masonry thickness and stepping deserves a second look here.

The Commission noted that context should be looked at as evolving – the context is the Lark and the Trinitas in the background – that is the context. Consider white, is a nice contrast instead of bringing a bunch of saturated colors. The balconies should be treated differently between the towers, which will help with articulation. The street orientation is difficult and subtle, and the building reveals itself as you approach, there should be better connectivity to the depot.

The Commission requested the applicant utilize North arrows on site and floor plans.

## Action

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