

AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: March 11, 2015

TITLE: 114 North Bedford Street – New
Development in the UMX District, 185-
Unit Housing Project. 4th Ald. Dist.
(36188)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: March 11, 2015

ID NUMBER:

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

Huggins recused herself on this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 11, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** for new development in the UMX District for a 185-unit housing project located at 114 North Bedford Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Ryan Sadowy, Tom Chinnock, Joe Herzog and Chris Johnson, representing CA Ventures; and Joe Porter, representing Ken Saiki Design. They are proposing a larger brick dimension to create a civic scale with breaks in the brick where windows are aligning vertically and read as almost one continuous window element. Within these reveals the metal above would match with the frame colors of the windows. A dynamic pedestrian experience on the street includes raised planters that undulate as you walk along Bedford Street, with bike parking along Mifflin Street and small ornamental trees. The bioswale has been removed due to City Engineering restrictions. Two colors of metal panels are proposed that allow for shifting in color, as well as composite wood. Planning staff feels most of the Urban Design Guidelines for this project have been met. Heather Stouder did bring attention to the landscaping; the details haven’t been provided yet on the terrace landscaping, recognizing that the area will be shadowed the majority of the time. The overall amount of glass will remain the same with exact window details to be provided in the future.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- What is the color of the mortar?
 - It will lean more towards uniformity than highly contrast.
The mortar should not be contrasting but match the brick color.
- My strong preference is to go to the modular brick. It always looks better, more elegant. I’ve seen really big buildings with modular brick for all different uses and it gives it an extra level of detail and quality, versus utility brick with is usually done for the sake of economy.
- I concur that the larger brick is generally a cost saving measure. A modular brick would be a finer, more appropriate at a pedestrian scale with a running bond.

- Being suspended as a panelized system is absolutely what this building is about, so I concur that the addition of a canopy wouldn't be a necessity.
 - Generally I like the building. In general the placement of plantings is fine, but look at your species. The landscaping isn't on par with the architecture, ho-hum. Look at different species, Serviceberry versus Muscledwood, question Kentucky Coffee tree and need to see the terrace species before final approval.
 - What are your thoughts on the coping detail?
 - We wanted to follow the profile as much as possible, so right now with the systems we have in place, there will probably be 5 or 6-inch difference between the brick and metal panel. We would like the coping to follow that but we weren't planning on capping it or anything like that. The goal would be not to see it.
 - Comparing it to one of the neighboring buildings, if you can keep this light and feel like the brick is hitting the sky, it would be a successful contrast.
 - I believe Amy (Landmarks Commission) said that cap on Doyle is not part of the original...not something to emulate.
- Needs to be minimal, to not see, knife-edge minimal.
- To me the base of the building is taller, the height has been accentuated. It happens to be similar to the neighbor, as long as it's in a much more modern dialogue it could be fine. It's how it meets the sky.
 - Is that wood composite material allowable?
 - (Stouder) Yes it's allowable. Staff still has some concerns with it as a base material, but it's definitely allowable. It's not a code issue, it's a preference issue. What's staff concern on it? One of the concerns, mostly raised by the Historic Preservation Planner and the Landmarks Commission is that it's another material, it's almost an accent used at the base, and overall simplification of materials, there was the thinking that that would be the first one to go. This is an opportunity to simplify the palette, and to give a strong enough base for the building.
 - I would say that given the color and uniformity, it's not trying to look like wood, it has a wood-like texture so I think it's appropriate. I don't see that it's going to be anything more than an accent.
 - On the north elevation, your side lights are not below the metal panel, take a look at that; transom instead of sidelight.
 - The detailing of the cement board drawings was brought up in the staff report.
 - We haven't discussed that.
 - Is it going to be a reveal?
 - It'll be a reveal with a metal joint. It'll look like a shadow reveal at around 1/4" but not shiny.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0). The motion provided that modular brick be used in a running bond as a base material for the lower four-stories, accepting the rounded corner without a canopy, with landscaping concerns addressed and to return to the landscape architects for approval.

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 rating for this project is 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 114 North Bedford Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	8	7	8	-	8	9	8

General Comments:

- Nice to see a project that breaks the mold.