

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: April 23, 2014

TITLE: 1924 Atwood Avenue – PD(SIP), Façade Modifications to a Previously Approved Fifty-Unit, Four-Story Apartment Building. 6th Ald. Dist. (29294)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Jay Wendt, Acting Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: April 23, 2014

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Tom DeChant, Lauren Cnare and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 23, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of façade modifications to a previously approved PD(SIP) located at 1927 Atwood Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce, Don Schroeder and Scott Lewis, all representing CMI Management. Bruce presented changes to the approved plans including elimination of the rotation. He noted the two street facing corners affected by the rotation and the interior floor plans. They felt the rotation would be viewed on the street level as something that was almost a mistake. You cannot get a feel for what happens on the upper level with the parapet; the module doesn’t present itself at pedestrian level. They are requesting that those elements be squared off. Also being requested is a change in building materials from corrugated metal siding to horizontal hardiplank on the rear façade and two sides, with the metal siding to remain on the street face. The window proportions have changed from 7-feet to 6-feet.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I like the white and the brick, but I really like is the light color of gravel or coping, versus this really dark heavy thing sitting on top. That just seems so much nicer than that heavy thing sitting up there.
- The dark metal panel was the tallest element and the brick pieces looked like planes. Now on the right the brick is the tallest element, so there are some other changes other than the angles that change the character of the building.
 - We had stretched that because of the rotation. We just didn’t feel it was successful so we brought that parapet height down a bit.

The canopy brow at the top of the building, in the new image it’s bracketed and hung and much more mock historic.
- The showing on the floor plan of the changes that are angular seems minor in terms of the plan change, but the character of the building changed substantially.
- I would simply have to concur. I feel the building got dumbed down basically.

- We're not trying to dumb the project down. We felt the dark window was an improvement. We can certainly look at options for that.
- The taller windows gave it a verticality that was really nice.
 - Part of that is that it's a different view. It does make some difference but if you look at the actual elevation I don't think you notice that.
- I agree about the brick. Whether it's an angled dark element or not, but the way the brick met the panel versus now where the brick is up higher and just stopping like a wing wall and not returning, versus engaging that like it is down here. That makes a big difference. I'm not personally attached to the angle but I would encourage keeping some of the same details.
- I can live with the angle change but these changes don't read as well.
- What's the thought behind changing materials as you go around the building?
 - Cost is one issue. But we had some experience with metal siding and in terms of keeping moisture out of that siding, we've had some problems so we wanted to limit its use.
- If you stayed with the massing of the first one and the darker metal element was elevated again, as opposed to bringing the brick further up, then the metal would have to be continuous on that. That helped it read.

ACTION:

By unanimous consent, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item at the request of the applicant. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0).