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December 23, 2013

Madison Landmarks Commission
Department of Planning \& Development
215 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
P.O. Box 2985

Madison, WI 53701-2985

## 121,123, and 127 West Gilman Street - Multi-Parcel Redevelopment

## Design Intent:

The owner of the building, Steve Brown Apartments, would like to redevelop the properties into (3) five-story buildings with shared underground parking. The new buildings would each be 21,325 square feet. There would be 60 total units consisting of (33) one- bedroom and (27) twobedroom units. Three of the units would be accessible units. Underground parking would consist of (60) total car stalls, as well as ample bike and moped parking. As part of the re-development, the current structure at 123 West Gilman Street would be re-located to an existing vacant lot one block to the East (113 West Gorham Street).

121 is an existing ten-story, 31,593 square foot apartment building. It sits on a 13,068 square foot (. 30 ac.$)$ site. There are currently 52 dorm style units in the building providing capacity for 206 residents.

123 is an existing two-story, 1,939 square foot house. It sits on a 4,356 square foot (. 10 ac .) site. There is currently 1 unit in the building providing capacity for 8 beds.

127 is an existing three-story, 4,927 square foot rooming house. It sits on a 6,864 square foot (. 16 ac.) site. The property capacity was 15 beds, but the house has been closed for safety reasons

It is worth noting that the proposed changes will decrease population density in the area and ease parking demand. It should also be noted that the proposed structures are five floors lower than the existing structure at 121 W . Gilman.

Steve Brown Apartments notified the alder, Ledell Zellers, and the Mansion Hill Neighborhood. We also met with representatives from the neighborhood association.

Construction on the project is intended to begin Spring of 2014. Any correspondence regarding the proposed project should be directed to me at Brownhouse at 663-5100 (ph.) or sfry@brownhousedesigns.com.

Sincerely,

Shane Fry, Architect

## brownhoulse

## Building Appropriateness:

The criteria for new construction in Mansion Hill are as follows (Madison General Ordinances Sec. 33.01(10)(e)):

1. The gross volume of any new structure shall be visually compatible with the buildings and environment with which it is visually related (visually related area). The gross volume of each of the proposed buildings is approximately 206,205 cubic feet. The largest building being replaced has a gross volume of 304,000 cubic feet. The next largest building in the VRA is 106,000 cubic feet. The Mansion Hill Historic District is marked by architectural diversity in both design and volume. Given that reality, it seems apparent that visual compatibility, not volume homogeneity, is the goal of this criteria and we for that reason and those listed below, feel strongly that the proposed buildings are in character with the VRA and the Mansion Hill District.
2. In the street elevation(s) of a new building, the proportion between the width and the height in the façade(s) shall be visually compatible with the buildings and the environment with which it is visually related (visually related area). The ratio of width to height $(\mathrm{W}: \mathrm{H})$ in the VRA ranges from .58 to 1.90 with an average of .83. The proposed buildings have a ratio of $.84, .80$, and .86 , well within the VRA range.
3. The proportions and relationships between width and height of the doors and windows in new street façade(s) shall be visually compatible with the buildings and environment with which it is visually related (visually related area). The ratio of width to height ( $\mathrm{W}: \mathrm{H}$ ) of primary doors in the VRA ranges from .32 to .90 with an average of .60 . The proposed buildings have a ratio of $.47, .50$, and .47 , well within the VRA range. The ratio of width to height $(\mathrm{W}: \mathrm{H})$ of windows in the VRA ranges from .42 to 1.09 , with an average of .63 . The proposed buildings have a ratio of $.68, .73$, and .69 , all within the VRA range.
4. The rhythm of solids to voids created by openings in the façade of the new structure should be visually compatible with the buildings and environment with which it is visually related (visually related area). The ratio of solid to void $(\mathrm{S}: \mathrm{V})$ in the VRA ranges from .71 to .89 , with an average of .79 . The proposed buildings have a ratio of $.71, .73$, and .71 , all within the VRA range.
5. All new street façades should blend with other buildings via directional expression. When adjacent buildings have a dominant vertical or horizontal expression, this expression should be carried over and reflected. The multifamily buildings in the VRA exemplify vertical expression. They also exude a defined base, middle, and top order. Our buildings are consistent with this vertical nature through their $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{B} / \mathrm{A}$ rhythm and as well as width to height ratios as indicated in section 2 . The distinctive entries, stone banding and material changes help to give the buildings a pedestrian scale and reflect the order that is prevalent in the VRA.












(1) SIDE ELEVATION - 121 W. GILMAN


| Street Address | Width | Height | Ratio (W:H) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 109 W. Gilman Street | 38.33 | 44.81 | 0.86 |
| 110 W. Gilman Street | 32.58 | 31.17 | 1.05 |
| 114 W. Gilman Street | 52.75 | 35.75 | 1.48 |
| 115 W. Gilman Street | 53.33 | 91.50 | 0.58 |
| 123 W. Gilman Street | 20.91 | 31.33 | 0.67 |
| 124 W. Gilman Street | 32.58 | 36.33 | 0.90 |
| 127 W. Gilman Street | 30.58 | 35.91 | 0.85 |
| 128 W. Gilman Street | 44.66 | 46.08 | 0.97 |
| 131 W. Gilman Street | 26.00 | 36.81 | 0.71 |
| 134 W. Gilman Street | 32.00 | 38.50 | 0.83 |
| 135 W. Gilman Street | 30.83 | 31.41 | 0.98 |
| 137 W. Gilman Street | 21.16 | 31.25 | 0.68 |
| 140 W. Gilman Street | 35.00 | 34.00 | 1.03 |
| 141 W. Gilman Street | 38.67 | 41.00 | 0.94 |
| 408 N. Carroll Street | 26.17 | 35.25 | 0.74 |
| 412 N. Carroll Street | 25.25 | 30.67 | 0.82 |
| 416 N. Carroll Street | 30.00 | 29.75 | 1.01 |
| 420 N. Carroll Street (Carroll elevation) | 29.17 | 32.25 | 0.90 |
| 420 N. Carroll Street (Gilman elevation) | 51.00 | 32.25 | 1.58 |
| 504 N. Carroll Street (Carroll elevation) | 26.75 | 33.00 | 0.81 |
| 504 N. Carroll Street (Gilman elevation) | 35.50 | 33.00 | 1.08 |
| 510 N. Carroll Street | 53.75 | 36.67 | 1.47 |
| 114 W. Gorham Street | 56.00 | 29.50 | 1.90 |
| 120 W. Gorham Street | 34.00 | 32.67 | 1.04 |
| 134 W. Gorham Street | 38.17 | 36.33 | 1.05 |
| 138 W. Gorham Street | 36.25 | 38.00 | 0.95 |
| AVERAGE RATIO (EXISTING BUILDINGS) | 35.82 | 37.12 | $\mathbf{0 . 9 6}$ |
| MEDIAN RATIO (EXISTING BUILDINGS) | 33.29 | 34.63 | $\mathbf{0 . 9 6}$ |
| LOWEST RATIO |  |  | $\mathbf{0 . 5 8}$ |
| HIGHEST RATIO |  |  | $\mathbf{1 . 9 0}$ |


| Street Address | Width | Height | Ratio (W:H) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 121 W. Gilman Street | 51.00 | 60.58 | 0.84 |
| 123 W. Gilman Street | 51.00 | 63.79 | 0.80 |
| 127 W. Gilman Street | 51.00 | 59.50 | 0.86 |
| AVERAGE RATIO (PROPOSED BUILDINGS) | $\mathbf{5 1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 . 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 3}$ |
| MEDIAN RATIO (EXISTING BUILDINGS) | $\mathbf{5 1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 . 5 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 4}$ |

## GENERAL NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

1) All areas shown in square feet
2) Existing buildings to be replaced shown highlighted
3) Ratio of 1.00 denotes a square elevation. If the ratio is less than 1.00 , the primary elevation of the building is taller than it is wide. Conversely, if the ratio is greater than 1.00, the elevation is wider than it is tall.
4) Our proposed buildings fall within the prescribed ratio range of a diverse neighborhood, but of particular note is the comparison between our buildings and the two apartment buildings within the VRA: the Blied building ( 141 W . Gilman) and the Elms building ( 109 W . Gilman). Not only do we closely match the ratios of these two buildings, we are nearly identical in ratio the building directly adjacent to our development.

|  | Primary (Front) Door Opening |  |  | Secondary Door Openings (Average) |  |  | Windows (Average) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Street Address | Width | Height | Ratio (W:H) | Width | Height | Ratio (W:H) | Width | Height | Ratio (W:H) |
| 109 W. Gilman Street | 6.33 | 7.00 | 0.90 | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | 5.58 | 5.11 | 1.09 |
| 110 W. Gilman Street | 3.50 | 7.00 | 0.50 | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | 2.56 | 4.23 | 0.61 |
| 114 W. Gilman Street | 6.00 | 8.00 | 0.75 | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | 5.31 | 5.34 | 0.99 |
| 115 W. Gilman Street | 6.00 | 8.00 | 0.75 | 6.00 | 7.00 | 0.86 | 6.91 | 8.00 | 0.86 |
| 123 W. Gilman Street | 3.00 | 7.00 | 0.43 | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | 1.65 | 3.90 | 0.42 |
| 124 W. Gilman Street | 3.00 | 8.00 | 0.38 | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | 3.00 | 5.56 | 0.54 |
| 127 W. Gilman Street | 4.50 | 8.50 | 0.53 | 3.33 | 8.50 | 0.39 | 2.63 | 4.90 | 0.54 |
| 128 W. Gilman Street | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | 3.08 | 6.64 | 0.46 |
| 131 W. Gilman Street | 6.00 | 8.00 | 0.75 | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | 2.85 | 5.30 | 0.54 |
| 134 W. Gilman Street | 3.50 | 7.00 | 0.50 | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | 2.19 | 5.06 | 0.43 |
| 135 W. Gilman Street | 3.00 | 7.00 | 0.43 | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | 2.42 | 5.38 | 0.45 |
| 137 W. Gilman Street | 3.00 | 8.00 | 0.38 | 3.00 | 8.00 | 0.38 | 2.90 | 5.47 | 0.53 |
| 140 W. Gilman Street | 5.50 | 8.00 | 0.69 | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | 3.21 | 6.28 | 0.51 |
| 141 W. Gilman Street | 6.00 | 8.00 | 0.75 | 3.00 | 7.83 | 0.38 | 4.33 | 5.44 | 0.80 |
| 408 N. Carroll Street | 6.25 | 9.33 | 0.67 |  | APPLICA |  | 2.96 | 5.78 | 0.51 |
| 412 N. Carroll Street | 5.33 | 9.00 | 0.59 |  | APPLICA |  | 3.75 | 5.04 | 0.74 |
| 416 N. Carroll Street | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | 2.80 | 3.76 | 0.74 |
| 420 N. Carroll Street | 7.25 | 10.33 | 0.70 | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | 3.37 | 7.03 | 0.48 |
| 504 N. Carroll Street | 3.00 | 7.00 | 0.43 | 3.00 | 7.00 | 0.43 | 3.02 | 4.04 | 0.75 |
| 510 N. Carroll Street | 3.00 | 9.50 | 0.32 | 3.00 | 7.00 | 0.43 | 3.92 | 8.21 | 0.48 |
| 114 W. Gorham Street | 3.50 | 6.67 | 0.52 | 3.00 | 6.67 | 0.45 | 3.79 | 5.04 | 0.75 |
| 120 W. Gorham Street | 5.50 | 8.00 | 0.69 | 5.50 | 8.00 | 0.69 | 2.78 | 3.83 | 0.73 |
| 134 W. Gorham Street | 6.42 | 8.25 | 0.78 | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | 2.63 | 4.77 | 0.55 |
| 138 W. Gorham Street | 5.33 | 8.00 | 0.67 | NOT APPLICABLE |  |  | 3.11 | 3.77 | 0.82 |
| AVERAGE RATIO (EXISTING BUILDINGS) | 4.77 | 7.98 | 0.60 | 3.73 | 7.50 | 0.50 | 3.36 | 5.33 | 0.63 |
| MEDIAN RATIO (EXISTING BUILDINGS) | 5.33 | 8.00 | 0.67 | 3.00 | 7.42 | 0.40 | 3.01 | 5.21 | 0.58 |
| LOWEST RATIOS |  |  | 0.32 |  |  | 0.38 |  |  | 0.42 |
| HIGHEST RATIOS |  |  | 0.90 |  |  | 0.86 |  |  | 1.09 |
| Street Address | Width | Height | Ratio (W:H) | Width | Height | Ratio (W:H) | Width | Height | Ratio (W:H) |
| 121 W. Gilman Street | 4.50 | 9.50 | 0.47 | 6.00 | 8.00 | 0.75 | 4.29 | 6.33 | 0.68 |
| 123 W. Gilman Street | 4.50 | 9.00 | 0.50 | 3.00 | 7.00 | 0.43 | 4.37 | 6.00 | 0.73 |
| 127 W. Gilman Street | 4.50 | 9.50 | 0.47 | 6.00 | 8.00 | 0.75 | 4.29 | 6.22 | 0.69 |
| AVERAGE RATIO (PROPOSED BUILDINGS) | 4.50 | 9.33 | 0.48 | 5.00 | 7.67 | 0.65 | 4.32 | 6.18 | 0.70 |
| MEDIAN RATIO (EXISTING BUILDINGS) | 4.50 | 9.50 | 0.47 | 6.00 | 8.00 | 0.75 | 4.29 | 6.22 | 0.69 |

## GENERAL NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

1) All areas shown in square feet
2) Existing buildings to be replaced shown highlighted
3) Ratio of 1.00 denotes a square door or window opening. If the ratio is less than 1.00 , the opening is taller than it is wide.

Conversely, if the ratio is greater than 1.00, the opening is wider than it is tall
4) The VRA features a wide range of primary door openings, which for these purposes include the doors themselves and any associated
sidelights or transoms. Most of the door openings have at least one of these features, as do our primary entrances.
5) Secondary door openings (i.e. side doors, doors to porches or balconies) are, for the most part, single doors without a sidelight or transom, but there are precedents for sidelights or double doors within secondary door openings in the VRA.
6) In keeping with the architectural diversity of the neighborhood, there is a wide range of window opening sizes within the VRA, and the average width:height ratio of our windows is near the statistical center of this range.

| Street Address | Void Area | Solid Area | Total Area | Ratio (V:T) | Ratio (S:T) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 109 W. Gilman Street | 435 | 1144 | 1579 | 0.28 | 0.72 |
| 110 W. Gilman Street | 195 | 812 | 1007 | 0.19 | 0.81 |
| 114 W. Gilman Street | 377 | 916 | 1293 | 0.29 | 0.71 |
| 115 W. Gilman Street | 490 | 3811 | 4301 | 0.11 | 0.89 |
| 123 W. Gilman Street | 109 | 436 | 545 | 0.20 | 0.80 |
| 124 W. Gilman Street | 140 | 772 | 912 | 0.15 | 0.85 |
| 127 W. Gilman Street | 203 | 754 | 957 | 0.21 | 0.79 |
| 128 W. Gilman Street | 342 | 1232 | 1574 | 0.22 | 0.78 |
| 131 W. Gilman Street | 200 | 590 | 790 | 0.25 | 0.75 |
| 134 W. Gilman Street | 198 | 837 | 1035 | 0.19 | 0.81 |
| 135 W. Gilman Street | 132 | 741 | 873 | 0.15 | 0.85 |
| 137 W. Gilman Street | 220 | 565 | 785 | 0.28 | 0.72 |
| 140 W. Gilman Street | 217 | 813 | 1030 | 0.21 | 0.79 |
| 141 W. Gilman Street | 366 | 1179 | 1545 | 0.24 | 0.76 |
| 408 N. Carroll Street | 186 | 729 | 915 | 0.20 | 0.80 |
| 412 N. Carroll Street | 107 | 427 | 534 | 0.20 | 0.80 |
| 416 N. Carroll Street | 344 | 1428 | 1772 | 0.19 | 0.81 |
| 420 N. Carroll Street | 516 | 2345 | 2861 | 0.18 | 0.82 |
| 504 N. Carroll Street | 667 | 2793 | 3460 | 0.19 | 0.81 |
| 510 N. Carroll Street | 298 | 1294 | 1592 | 0.19 | 0.81 |
| 114 W. Gorham Street | 175 | 749 | 924 | 0.19 | 0.81 |
| 120 W. Gorham Street | 232 | 763 | 995 | 0.23 | 0.77 |
| 134 W. Gorham Street | 287 | 1026 | 1313 | 0.22 | 0.78 |
| 138 W. Gorham Street | 247 | 1017 | 1264 | 0.20 | 0.80 |
| AVERAGE RATIO (EXISTING BUILDINGS) | $\mathbf{2 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 9}$ |
| MEDIAN RATIO (EXISTING BUILDINGS) | $\mathbf{2 2 6}$ | 825 | $\mathbf{1 0 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 0}$ |
| LOWEST RATIO |  | 534 | $\mathbf{0 . 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 9}$ |  |
| HIGHEST RATIO |  | $\mathbf{0 . 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 9}$ |  |  |


| Street Address | Void Area | Solid Area | Total Area | Ratio (V:T) | Ratio (S:T) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 121 W. Gilman Street | 891 | 2189 | 3080 | 0.29 | 0.71 |
| 123 W. Gilman Street | 880 | 2363 | 3243 | 0.27 | 0.73 |
| 127 W. Gilman Street | 865 | 2158 | 3023 | 0.29 | 0.71 |
| AVERAGE RATIO (PROPOSED BUILDINGS) | $\mathbf{8 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 2}$ |
| MEDIAN RATIO (PROPOSED BUILDINGS) | $\mathbf{8 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 1}$ |

## GENERAL NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

1) All areas shown in square feet
2) Existing buildings to be replaced shown highlighted
3) Ratios are shown as void area (i.e. windows, doors, etc.) to total elevation area and solid area to total elevation area. When these two ratios of a particular building are added together, the total should be 1.00
4) The buildings at 420 N. Carroll and 504 N. Carroll are on corner lots, so primary elevations include both street-facing elevations.
5) Of particular note is the comparison between our new development and the two existing apartment buildings within the VRA: the Blied Building ( 141 W . Gilman) and the Elms building ( 109 W . Gilman). The new development is very similar to both buildings in terms of void and solid ratios, and is nearly identical to the Elms building, which is directly adjacent.

