

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: January 27, 2016

TITLE: 1000 East Washington Avenue – New
Development in UDD No. 8, 2nd Ald. Dist.
(40049)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: January 27, 2016

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Cliff Goodhart*, Tom DeChant, Lois Braun-Oddo, Richard Slayton, Sheri Carter and John Harrington.

Goodhart recused himself on this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 27, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of new development in UDD No. 8 located at 1000 East Washington Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Paul Raisleger and Richard Arnesen, representing Stone House Development; Ken Saiki and Julia Schilling, representing Ken Saiki Design.

The tower has turned back to brick with the horizontal metal piece returning to its original color (medium bronze). The entry piece is manufactured stone in a smooth coat with accent of rough cut to relate to Breese Stevens Field. Terra cotta panels and accent metal panels are also proposed. EIFS is no longer proposed on the affordable units, but instead will be an ivory colored metal panel, which ties into other expressions to tie the two together. Canopy trees will be planted in double rows down East Washington Avenue. Low perennials are proposed for the affordable units on the East Mifflin Street side. Planters will act as a buffer for the grade 1 ½-foot grade change between the building and the sidewalk. Images of City Row were shown as the plantings will be very similar.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- There’s a strong repetition going down, but the trees are not aligned with that, so they lose that rhythm with the trees. Why did you decide to do that?
 - The trees were chosen to serve as you approach the entry.
I’m trying to understand the rhythm and it looks more informal than the strength of the building.
- Having the planter wall starts to tighten the sidewalk. I’d almost rather have no wall, low plantings and every now and then, place a bench. Avoid that wall and let it be more open to the pedestrians.
- I think the alignment of the trees isn’t quite right for the building.
- A feature planting that frames that entry, but to have those columnar trees aligning those vertical columns help brings the building to the site better.
- Last time we talked to you about your all glass upper story and about using safety glass for birds.

- We took a look at that. Bird-safe glass is much more expensive (a “regular” glass wall might cost \$100,000; that same size in bird-safe glass would cost \$280,000). It would perform about the same as about two layers of uncoated glass, so there’s an energy concern and a cost concern.

What can you do to address that issue? There are low cost ways of dealing with it. You’ve got this big massive glass. It’s an issue all over, I’m not going to say it’s not.

- We do have it broken up with a solid horizontal and we’ve raised the parapet up a little bit. We have minimized it a little bit. Anything short of doing the bird glass, we’d have to decrease the height of that, but that’s an amenity and part of the design aesthetic.

I don’t disagree with that, I’m just wondering if you could put some kind of screeners or cables through there that would detract the birds but still wouldn’t be very visible from the ground, on the outside. It does concern me.

- That’s something we could take a look at.

Heather Stouder noted that staff is supportive of the direction the project is taking on details and landscape design. Precedent-wise the Commission has had a very high bar with the level of detail on particularly landscaping, planter materials, rooftop terraces, etc. Those details still need to come together and should be reflected in the Commission’s motion. Parallel to that the lighting detail is very good, but final elevation drawings need to show where those are located on the building elevations rather than just in plan view. The mid-block path directly east of the building has a lot of details that still need to be worked out. A path needs to be at least 8-feet rather than the 4 or 5-foot sidewalk shown today on the plans; recognizing that as a Commission and leaving that up to staff and the developer to work through would be beneficial. Traffic Engineering is looking for a path that will accommodate two-way pedestrian traffic, as well as bicyclists at least walking their bicycles, knowing the Mifflin Bike Boulevard is immediately north of the site.

ACTION:

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Braun-Oddo, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0). The motion provided for address of the following:

- Final landscape plan for review by staff shall include details and specifications of planters and other amenities, ground cover for terraces, etc.
- Final lighting plan for review by staff shall include photometrics, cut sheets, and corresponding elevation drawings showing lighting on the building.
- UDC approval acknowledges that the details for the mid-block pedestrian path will be changing based on final review by Planning and Traffic Engineering staff.