

## AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** April 6, 2016

**TITLE:** 722 Williamson Street – New Development Containing 142 Residential Units (96 in the New Building Adjacent to Bike Path and 46 Within the Olds Seed Building) and Approximately 7,200 Square Feet of Commercial Space. 6<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (41575)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** April 6, 2016

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair\*; Lois Braun-Oddo, Cliff Goodhart, Richard Slayton\*, Dawn O’Kroley, Sheri Carter, John Harrington, Tom DeChant and Michael Rosenblum.

\*Wagner recused himself on this item; Slayton acted as Chair.\*

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 6, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a new development containing 142 residential units and approximately 7,200 square feet of commercial space located at 722 Williamson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Marc Schellpfeffer, Paul Cuta, Michael Metzger and Lance McGrath, all representing McGrath Property Group; Abbie Moilien, representing Ken Saiki Design; and Jesse Pycha-Holst, representing the Marquette Neighborhood Association.

Jesse Pycha-Holst spoke in support of the project. The neighborhood group voted last month to support this proposal, with concerns about connectivity with the back of the newer building and the bike path right-of-way. In terms of the long-term safety of that right-of-way, human eyes will work better than additional lighting; they are looking for the back of the building to have a much more usable entrance. Setting back the lot line would allow for more greenspace.

The challenge of the site was how to activate the internal qualities of it; reactivating the Olds elevation and bringing commercial to that building, but the residential component along the north edge of the site needs pedestrian movement back to Williamson Street. The single entry point allows people to filter into the new residential component, or up into the lofts or the community space and adjacent terrace. Everything comes in off of Williamson Street to two levels of parking. To respect the Olds building without replicating it, building materials will include darker brick with an iron spot to it, and two types of colored metal panels. The windows within the Olds building will be a dark bronze on aluminum frames. Having the lantern as an independent component and not actually attaching to the existing structure they feel is appropriate, while it identifies and separates the residential entry point from the overall movement down the promenade itself, with commercial use within that terrace being independent of the two.

The north side articulation is important; some attempts to address that have been made.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Find a way to extend or add an element on the ground floor that people could use to enjoy the bike path and explore a way to bring out parts of the building toward the property line that aren't already out there.
- You don't have another building to play off of. And the dog run sounds nice, but in reality it's too small.
- On the front you've got two trees, can you get a third in there? Islands are not for light poles.
- There's a grouping of three windows on the left and three windows on the right. What's behind those windows?

- Parking.

What if the building on the left doubled the number or added two more so it looks like something different. You're repeating a rhythm of the windows on the inside that's making no sense on the outside. It works well on the right side.

- This looks like a nice place for a major tree, rather than compacting more. That would help break that up a bit.
- This is a fantastic way to get eyes on the bike path, and activity. And adding more punches would give the base a feeling of being lighter, as opposed to the three big punches. The balconies will greatly activate that bike path area.
- The top of the new brick mass articulation and how that top floor sits upon that bottom level; because the punches are all the same it feels less rich and could have another layer of richness. Something a little more front-facing. That lantern does fit together really nicely now.
- There's a rationale for using the EIFS but there's no reason for bringing that to the ground. I can't see a base treatment.
  - Landmarks had the comment related to the four piers on the elevated terrace. They looked for your input on if those would be concrete.
- I'm just concerned that this Commission of record doesn't put anything within 4-feet, or in some instances 8-feet from the ground. You have a reason for using EIFS, but at the ground plane there's no reason for that, but I don't see any detail telling me what the material is.
- If it's for continuity of the elevation, I could see maybe a Portland cement stucco, something that's really hard and durable.
- I could too, but again I don't know what it is.
- (Ald. Rummel) This project is very exciting and there's a lot of support for it. I really appreciate Dawn's comments about that portion of the gray façade top and how to make it look more interesting; I thought it looked like every other building going up. And I appreciate all the comments about the rear side and some of the suggestions to resolve that, because I know maybe you can't meet MNA's goal to have an inside door entry, but you can do some things to break up that mass. I'm wondering if the entryway to the main corridor is too close to the dog washing station; what about the people who are afraid of dogs, is that too close?
  - If you're going to utilize the bike path entryway, coming down from this elevator those are off to the side.
- I think you're hearing us about the treatment of that side; the front door to the bike path is being treated like a backside of something. I know the building has constraints, but even responding to why you'd want to sit out there, it's a beautiful greenspace and I want to make sure that we in the neighborhood see this as a real asset and you're going to help make it even more of an asset the way you design your building.
  - I think there is a balance between how inviting you make that for where it is but still provide a level of understanding that it's a private front porch.

- I'm not proposing a front porch, just how you design it that you're the front of an important corridor that everyone in the neighborhood loves.
- Is there any division from these parking lots?
  - On the Livingston property there is a wash there, a curb and some rock so there would be curb on our property line that identifies that.
- Why aren't there trees there? It would help you identify that "this is the site."

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Carter, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion approves the use of EIFS with the option of a precast concrete base or a Portland cement stucco base.