

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: May 5, 2010

TITLE: 1208, 1212, 1214 Spring Street –
PUD(GDP-SIP) for an 8-Story Apartment
Building. 8th Ald. Dist. (16968)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 5, 2010

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Richard Wagner, John Harrington, Jay Ferm, Ron Luskin and Mark Smith.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 5, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1208, 1212 and 1214 Spring Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Christopher Gosch of bark design, representing Gebhardt Development; Christopher Thiel, Dave Martin and Jeremy Oliyotti. Gosch presented plans and spoke on precast issues which were further qualified by Martin and Oliyotti, including a discussion on finish quality and color of the precast panels with samples as distributed. A major change was switching over to a metal panel with prefinished metal awnings and capping with painted metal grate railings on balconies. Bike parking and visitor scooter parking was added to the front to address the landscape plan. Grasses and native vegetation will be used to emphasize the rhythm of the building. Parking and access are through the back of the building. The pavers on the terraces will be picked up in the plaza to tie them together. On the roof will be some slow release detention. The green roof that was previously discussed is not in the budget. It is proposed to use a turf block, or grass paved system for bike and scooter parking as a more sustainable solution than just pouring concrete. Zoning and parking requirements were discussed. Further discussion included green roof amenities, lighting, stormwater detention and local product use. Countertops will use recycled materials. Comments by the Commission were as follows:

- The north elevation of the building does not address the change in scale. The north face may lose that if it’s purely one plane.
- The balconies should be 5-feet rather than the 4-feet depicted to make them more usable. It was noted they are smaller to prevent large groups from gathering on them.
- Well done.
- The precast samples are lighter in color than the drawings and boards. Look at making color bolder.
- We generally do require 5-foot balconies to make them usable. 4-foot balconies can often become storage zones rather than a used zone. Look at making them 5-feet to avoid bicycle storage.

Further comments included:

- Use caution on the plant selection. Concern with maintenance.

- Consider more impact with the landscape plan, more contemporary. When you mention natives, make sure they're native.
- Concern that the color will make the building look like a giant concrete block. Everything fades.
- Address is too far up from the street and too small for pedestrian traffic.
- Concern with bike rack locations being out of the way. Rethink where bike parking can go.
- Rethink number of bike racks at the front of the building, along with the seating.
- Concern with taking away what can be public space with bike parking.
- Agree bike stalls should not be in back. Explore having it on the south side of the building closer to Spring Street.
- Impressed with your presentation, graphics, sensibility of the project, terrific. Need to see more architecture. There are a lot of details in the renderings that are not detailed in the documents.
- We will want to see the actual color and material that will be put on the building in order to give final approval.
- Concern with color variations in renderings and samples. Colors samples shown not bold.
- Try to get a little more accurate with your materials for final approval.
- Plans and elevations are not coordinated. There is a level of detail that is missing from the plans.
- Try to anticipate how people will move through the area and use it; need to show.
- Provide mow strip where lawn meets building, grey or charcoal grey.
- Roof should allow for addition of future green roof structurally.
- Use small hole pavers.
- Use bolder scale and treatment of landscaping, for example a line of one type of planting or tree, etc.
- Make sure native plantings are really native.
- Need to make sure there is enough difference in precast colors so when they fade it doesn't look like a big concrete building.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion for initial approval required the following:

- Provide actual materials and color samples that will be utilized on the building.
- Final approval will require inclusion of the perspective renderings along with making sure that all building elevations are sufficiently detailed to reflect their features.
- Elevations should show the profile of the penthouse so we know the massing and materials of the penthouse.
- Further information for color studies.
- More specific architectural details on the project, including changes in plane as detailed with the perspective renderings.
- Further investigation on the use of hanging bike racks.
- Provide accessibility to the roof.
- Minimum dimension of 4'6" (highly encourage 5') so the balconies are not used as storage spaces.
- Encourage a 2-foot strip of a green roof around the space to enliven it.
- More extensive site plan that shows connection of where people should go, shouldn't go, and will go.
- Provide 8-16 bike stalls within easy access of the front door.
- Study moving the interior northeast bike parking stalls to someplace more secure and safe.

- Resolve issue with north elevation's punched square windows; out of character, look at another proportion, out of place.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 5, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 7, 7 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1208, 1212, 1214 Spring Street

Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
-	7	-	-	-	-	-	7
8	7	6	5	-	7	7	7
5	6	5	-	6	5	6	6
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
5	6	6	-	-	5	6	6
6	6	4	6	-	5	6	6
6	7	6	-	-	6	7	6
5	5	5	-	5	5	5	5
6	7	-	5	5	4	9	8

General Comments:

- Use more color. Bring street context views. Like effort so far.
- Just a little bit of green roof please.
- We need to see a lot more detail in regards to the architectural elements. Context renderings are a must for final approval.
- Planting along west out of context with building (more contemporary and larger scale needed). Architectural style very good and excellent scale.
- Exterior bike parking needs work to be safe, convenient and adequate in quantity. Nice project. Good attention to energy efficiency.