

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION                      **PRESENTED:** August 4, 2014

TITLE:            740 Jenifer/739 (741) Williamson                      **REFERRED:**  
                     Streets – New construction of                                      **REREFERRED:**  
                     residential building in Third Lake  
                     Ridge Historic District. 6<sup>th</sup> Ald.                                      **REPORTED BACK:**  
                     District. Contact: Stephen Mar-Pohl,  
                     InSite Consulting Architects (34796)

AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary                      **ADOPTED:**                      **POF:**

DATED: August 4, 2014                                      **ID NUMBER:**

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

Chris Oddo, representing RPG, registering in support and wishing to speak. Oddo described the need for the land division as previously discussed during the review of the residential project at 740 Jenifer. Oddo explained the project and how the project meets the standards in relation to the Visually Related Area (VRA). He explained the items that were evaluated and analyzed for the submission and the overall design of the proposed building.

Oddo provided updated handouts for review and discussed drawings on presentation boards and on the screen. He explained the volume of the building and how the front elevation reads as two separate buildings separated by a green wall at the elevator tower. He explained that the volume is further reduced by the articulation of the facades. The side and rear elevations have been further reduced by articulation and change in materials.

Oddo explained the proposed materials (fiber cement horizontal siding of varying widths and panels, reclaimed wood siding, concrete) and how the materials are consistent with the other buildings in the VRA. Oddo explained that the vertical siding orientation provides a more narrow appearance and that the concrete is a predominant foundation material in the VRA.

Oddo explained that even though the foundations of the adjacent residential buildings are exposed on the street side, living spaces have been moved to the upper floors to get away from the street noise leaving the lower level for utility spaces not living spaces.

Oddo explained that due to revised accessibility requirements, the building height is able to be reduced by 12". He explained that the building footprint has been revised to be smaller and that any further reduction would negatively affect the quality of the living spaces.

Rummel asked how one would bring in their bike. Oddo explained that they would likely use the garage door, but could use the side door. He pointed out the bike parking provided in the garage and outside the building.

Rosenblum asked for clarification about the plant materials proposed for the green wall. Oddo explained that the Landscape Architect selected a climbing hydrangea for the green wall and provided an image of a hydrangea growing in Madison with a similar orientation. Rummel asked if the hydrangea was a native plant. Oddo explained that the Landscape Architect prefers the use of native plants.

Michael Matty, registering in support and wishing to speak and available to answer questions. Matty explained that the flat roof form allows for green roof options that could relate to storm water management. He explained that the Ott House is the tallest building on the block and the proposed building is not as tall as the Ott House.

Rummel asked if Matty had any further comments that he wanted to share. Matty explained that he wants to construct a quality building and that the design has been modified to respond to the comments made by the neighborhood and the Commissions. Matty also explained that the referral would bump him from the schedule he needs for financing. Rummel asked if he would consider removing the parking. Matty explained that people do not want to live at that level due to the street activity and noise and that the removal of the parking will not change the design of the building.

Michael Soref, representing Marquette Neighborhood Association, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Lindsey Lee, registering in support but not wishing to speak.

Staff explained that other agencies will review neighborhood plans and zoning and the Landmarks Commission shall review the project based on the Ordinance standards. Staff explained that there have been numerous meetings with the applicants about this project and that this project was easier to support when it was a three story building. The three story project went before the Urban Design Commission so the project team received design direction from the Commissions in the incorrect order. In addition, staff explained that the building would be better suited to the north side of the street than the south side given the different characters of the different sides of the street. Staff explained that more information is needed to provide a better analysis for compatibility in the VRA.

Rummel asked if the elevator tower could be relocated. Oddo explained the reasoning for the elevator location.

Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator, explained the zoning requirements and that the adopted plan recommends 2.5-story building and that this building is a 4-story building. He explained how to calculate a story based on the zoning definition. He also explained that there is not a requirement for the development to provide car parking.

Rummel explained that the plans are frustrating because what works for one development is not appropriate for another development.

Slattery explained that she appreciates the modern architecture and likes the idea of the green wall, but is uncomfortable with how the building relates to the VRA.

Oddo explained that the existing buildings appear to be paired along the street and that the proposed building will continue that massing. Rosenblum explained that the height and appearance of the building reads successfully as two buildings given the green wall element.

There was general discussion about the appearance and materials and how they might be modified to better fit the VRA.

Heidi Radlinger, registering neither in support or opposition.

**ACTION:**

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Rosenblum, to advise the Plan Commission that the Landmarks Commission finds that the land division is appropriate. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Rosenblum, to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the new development with a requirement that the property owner continue to maintain the living wall. The motion passed by voice vote/other.