

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: January 23, 2013

TITLE: 210 Langdon Street – PUD-GDP-SIP for
the Construction of a New Fraternity
House. 2nd Ald. Dist. (28428)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: January 23, 2013

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, Tom DeChant, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Cliff Goodhart, Melissa Huggins and Dawn O’Kroley.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 23, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-GDP-SIP located at 210 Langdon Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Randy Bruce, Knothe & Bruce Architects, LLC. Bruce presented the site plan, showing some flexibility with the fire access with the double loaded parking bay. Landscaping has been added at the sidewalk with increased landscaping along the edge. They have removed the invasive planting species and added new trees. Wood heads on the windows have been stretched out for a more significant bearing angle and make them a stronger element. Light colored windows have been replaced with darker windows. A photographic sample of the stone was shown; the dormer will be green.

Comments and questions by the Commission were as follows:

- The landscape plan doesn’t do justice to what you’ve got going on here. The Maple in front isn’t a very tall growing tree. Try Hybrid Elms or Hybrid Oaks, something that has substantial scale. The Carpinus in the back should be replaced also. The elements don’t play with the architecture; it needs to be refined.
- You’re in one of the most precious historic districts of the City. I think the details need one more level of refinement. Thoughts like the concrete walk, creating a band in the stone. We’re transition from concrete to a piece of stone (precast), some of those details how the modern materials are now being used in this more traditional style.
- Showing the two porches as equal detracts from your main entry.
- This is a phenomenal environment you’re working in and it deserves a higher level of detailing.
- EIFS sills concern me.
 - If we were to use stone it would have to be hung off the wood structure behind it and now we’ve got multiple materials that we have to integrate. From a building science perspective I think we’re much better off with one material. I understand the concern over EIFS in general, particularly in sills, so we’ve talked about using the reinforcing mesh on the sills to give it a much higher degree of durability. It can conform to the shape we need so there is some benefit.

You can't get that crispness with EIFS, those sharp lines. They do pretty amazing things with PVC and other materials that have a real crisp line to them. It just looks really crude when you try to do sharp details.

- The dark green is a better complement to the building.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion stated that the two "arms" out front could be equal or unequal, the packets should be updated to reflect the project as presented, and the landscaping plan can return to staff to address Harrington's comments. In addition, eliminate the black diamond for metal edging, provide additional architectural detailing and refinement in address of Amy Scanlon's comments and provide an alternative to the EIFS sills and lintels, including consideration of other synthetic alternative materials in addition to stone, etc. Resolve details with staff relevant to construction materials and the appropriateness to a historic district. Further discussion stated that there are details that need to be resolved and enhanced, and it is not the Commission's role to say "move the porch back a foot or two;" it's the overall design concept.

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 6, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 210 Langdon Street

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

General Comments:

- Appropriate historic details important.
- Details, especially window and porch, could still be improved. Prefer darker EIFS color with dark windows.
- Overall good building, except for use of EIFS on window sills/lintels. Resolve design details of structure and materials.