

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: April 6, 2016

TITLE: 510 University Avenue – New 12+ Story Mixed-Use Project, “The Hub at Madison II” with 348 Apartment Units, Approximately 8,740 Square Feet of Retail and 2,992 Square Feet of Flex Space. 4<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (36901)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

\*Modifications to Previously Approved Plans\*

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: April 6, 2016

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Cliff Goodhart, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Sheri Carter, John Harrington\* and Michael Rosenblum.

\*Harrington abstained on this item.\*

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 6, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED PARTIAL FINAL APPROVAL** of modifications to previously approved plans for a mixed-use project located at 510 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Brian Munson, Jeff Zelisko and Tai Maki, representing Core Spaces, LLC. Zelisko reviewed the modified items necessary to meet code requirements:

8, 11, 12, 20, 24, & 29

- #8: Balconies are now cantilevered.
- #11: The glass pool terrace scope is reduced. A seeded green roof will be included in the roof that won’t require a screen.
- #12: Lightning masts are not visible.
- #20: On the Gilman Street side the 8<sup>th</sup> floor planting plan has been removed due to inaccessibility.
- #24: Columns are not clad in brick due to an easement that would be encroached. The other side requires a 20-foot wide drive-thru to parking at the rear property; the brick would put them at less than 20-feet. The columns are now shown unclad and painted black.
- #29: Once the pool area was consolidated, they were able to get required 4,000 square feet of open space onto the green roof.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Item #29, moving all of the green roofs to the upper roof is a huge loss. One big urban gesture that this project had made was having a green roof low that all of the high rises around could appreciate.

- Terraces are still surrounded by planters and higher shrubs. The only difference is where we were going to have sedum we'll now have stone. The light there is going to be sparse at best. Not a stitch of plant material is lost.
- So maybe #29 is worded such that it isn't completely clear what the change was.
  - We'll make that clear.
- I see a lot less detail and interest on the storefronts, I think you've lost a lot on area.
  - We've actually added a layer of detail. The windows here have a different line of mullions compared to what's below. Other than that we have all the same materials. We did consolidate 3 entry points.
  - We turned down the transparency on the windows.
- It does look more rigid in the new proposal than there was a little more variety with that varying mullion spacing previously.
- Part of it may be the rendering; those mullions appear dark whereas on the sheet they appear light.
- Why couldn't those concrete edges be faced with a channel that's mounted to the face of the concrete to give it depth and continuity in material and color like everywhere else on the building. Because of the long perspective you get of the building, having something nice and crisp at the edge is necessary. Consistency in the details.
- Looking at that historic piece that was retained – previously to the right of that you had a 4-story glass read. Now it looks like that's been broken into a one-story with a 3-story read above it. I'm concerned with that change plus your change in articulation on the first vertical addition onto the historic building, it reads much heavier.
  - We could not find a color to match that tan color, so we were going to do an appliqué on the back of the glass. We wanted that to be a spandrel glass, where normally we try to make it disappear with a gray color.
- But you have a 6-story building sitting on a 1-story building with another 4-story “cap” on top of it. It isn't as articulated to meet that base and be appropriate to that base. It's the scale.
- In comparison to the scale of that whole façade, the canopy could be a little bit wider. It seems so small.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Rosenblum, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED PARTIAL FINAL APPROVAL** of the project modifications. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0-1) with Harrington abstaining. The motion provided for address of the Commission's comments on items #2 and #8 (the canopy and the edges of the project balconies), #29 final rooftop plans, #19 further detailed renderings of the Gilman Street façade and context. The motion did not approve the signage and lighting plans, which shall return for final review and approval.