

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: December 14, 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: December 14, 2016

ID NUMBER:

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

*Goodhart recused himself on this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 14, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of modifications to new development in UDD No. 8 located at 1000 East Washington Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Rich Arnesen and Paul Raisleger, representing Stone House Development.

The Secretary noted that the team met with staff to discuss numerous alterations to the project from the originally approved conditions. The projected balconies have become French balconies and recessed balconies to flatten out the face. On the 11th floor they pushed back about 10-feet and wrapped the roof patio around it and aligned everything with the exterior face. The mullion colors on the tower are now a darker bronze to add depth and pop; along with that, the lighter brown accent bands are now that same bronze color. On the east alley side, a change in color ties in better with the tower. At the retail entries on the corner, they had full canopies in all the bays and at the corner; the canopy at the corner is now a sun screen, and above the first level storefronts the louvers have been removed and replaced with an aluminum composite panel and putting in louvers whenever a retailer will need it. On the affordable housing, they changed the front door location to Mifflin Street, reduced the window opening sizes, and tweaked some of the materials and colors to simplify the palette. To create the monolithic look the off-white accent pieces are proposed EIFS; and it has been eliminated from the ground plane. The landscaping on the third floor parking deck has been refined and now relates more to the units.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Is there any concern that the retailers doing louvers or canopies could end up being hodgepodge?
 - Right now there’s only 2 or 3 bays by the entry that are not leased.
 - It could look hodgepodge. The eastern most bays are leased, they’re not retail tenants so if we did it, it would make sense to only allow it here. These bays could have it, but not all of them.
 - It would center around that main entry.
- The EIFS reads as very white on the rendering. Is it going to match the aluminum closely, and why not use aluminum there?

- We don't want to use the aluminum composite panel, but if we go with a lower grade aluminum we run the risk of oil canning, where you see it waving in the light.
- What is the material of the window frame?
 - Treated vinyl. They were originally aluminum.
- All of the revisions are good improvements and refinements, but I'm struggling with the design of the bays on the formal housing side. The previous bays were asymmetrical and implied more of an entry to each of the units, and felt more like a neighborhood. Now it feels much more monolithic and there could potentially be just one door to enter all of these units. They each have a walk-up, but the elevation feels less like a collection of a community, because I think they're all symmetrical now.
- I think the issue is before the way the floors were they hinted at an entrance, and now that hint is totally gone. The way the building visually engaged the street.
- Break down the three-story projecting elements; look at pushing out balconies or add an awning or canopy to enhance or express the entries. Also study first and second floor treatment to further break down the three-story façade element.
- Could you study the first and second floors to see if there's some answer?
 - Sure, some material things.
- What is happening at the top of the EIFS bands?
 - It's a little parapet.
- We're in an urban environment. Any time you get water coming down the face of that it's going to look dirty. If you did something in a smoother finish it wouldn't catch.
 - There are smooth finish EIFS products we can look into, you're going to have that wash on it anyway. And Stone House maintains all their own projects themselves.
- On Mifflin and Brearly, previously it had a larger project sign; I think somewhere between it and the previously proposed size would be adequate. Also moving the ramp over would allow for more green.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Rosenblum, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0-1) with Wagner non-voting and Goodhart recused. The motion provided for address of the comments made to be reviewed and approved by staff.