

## AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> February 21, 2018
TITLE: 2507 Winnebago Street – PD(SIP), New Development of 59 Units of Affordable and Market-Rate Grand Family and Kinship Family Housing in Two Buildings. 6 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (48349)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: February 21, 2018	<b>ID NUMBER:</b> 48349

---

Members present: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, John Harrington, Tom DeChant, Cliff Goodhart, Rafeeq Asad and Lois Braun-Oddo.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of February 21, 2018, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PD(SIP) for development of affordable and market-rate grand family and kindship family housing in two buildings located at 2507 Winnebago Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Mark Smith, Nicole Sonheim, both representing Gorman & Co.; Justin Frahm, representing JSD Professional Services, Inc.; and Kenneth Fitzsimmons. The applicant presented the project and provided material samples, a review of the site layout and circulation, outdoor spaces, playground and community garden. Feedback from the neighbors indicated an interest in garden areas. The development team wanted to emphasize the plaza and walk as defined by the two buildings. They are planning a traffic-calming device. The rendering implies a well-defined space. The site is very accessible, with street and walk-ups to entries at grade. They reviewed active vs. passive outdoor spaces and the transition to the bike path. The landscape plan shows large canopies around the buildings with smaller plantings in the plaza. The plantings differ from the development across the street. They will have some walk-ups for 3-bedrooms facing Winnebago Street, plus balconies. The backside has direct access to a courtyard. They have concentrated higher quality toward the street, particularly on the first-story and propose modular brick to feel like neighborhood buildings. They have chosen two different aesthetic looks.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- What are the brick colors?
  - Wire cut brick with a velour finish (soft finish) but not tumbled or embellished (Building B/7). Siding sample colors are not yet finalized, but options were shown. They will be warmer and less bright.
- I have several issues. Residential projects should not tell what kind of project it is. This looks like low-income housing based on the architecture. It makes it look dead, the porches look as cheap as could possibly be. It looks like there’s no effort put into the design, I don’t know if it’s the materials, but they don’t complement each other. When I look at the renderings I have a problem, I don’t know if it’s the architecture or materials, but it’s flat, there’s no push and pull. You can do more. The robustness of the

porch that would help the design is just not there. It looks like most of the effort and design was placed on the landscaping rather than the architecture. The buildings don't have to be identical but they should complement each other.

- The articulation on Building 7 is more successful, maybe it's just because you have the colors run vertical rather than Building 6. Building 7 has more interest and it feels more individual, that verticality supports that, then 6 just goes the other way with the strong base. Bring some consistency.
- I have a more negative reaction to 6 than 7 and I think it is because you're carrying the color vertically. When presented materials rather than what is shown in the drawings, they are shockingly different.
- You have some building entrances that look like porches but lead to the entry lobby. The building entrances aren't highly defined.
- HVAC units should be better integrated into the design.
  - As it turns out there's a very distinct split in size of units between 1-2 bedroom units, when you hit the 1,000 square foot mark you need a conventional furnace because the all-in-one type units aren't efficient enough. The units that face Winnebago Street with have an in-and-out conventional furnace (intake and combustion).
- We expect more integration with the design of the HVAC, regardless of budget. Turn around the side.
  - There are only a few that are on the front face.
- Building 7 is more successful because of the vertical rhythm.
- These porches are just focused on the doorway. Most porches go across the windows so you don't just have a passageway.
  - Pulling the porch in front of the bedroom takes space from the bedroom. On the first floor it's possible but I would be somewhat concerned with security. Or is it a situation where the window treatments are constantly closed, maybe that's OK, maybe not. I would like to get feedback from our operations people or from residents to make sure they would be comfortable with that.
- Porch seems cheap – a more generous porch would help.
- Building 6 – the main entry is at the east side of building. What's inside that?
  - It is not a grand lobby space by any means.
- I'm wondering if you could project the brick to the roofline at the entrance and draw attention to where the main entries are. Also make that more storefront so as you walk in you can see that, and that would feel safer. Open that up.
- Who is that surface parking for?
  - This is here because we have to have room for the fire apparatus/fire lane. Not everyone likes to park under a building – i.e. visitors. We wanted to make sure we could accommodate those folks uncomfortable with parking underneath, but the idea was to keep it as small as possible.
- How do those who park in ADA stalls get to building? I have concerns with those distances. Figure a better way.
  - The street is an option, and if you're a resident and park underneath you could certainly use the elevator. There are other options.
- I think you need to find a way to get them into the building without having to go such long distances. Otherwise the site plan works. On the planting, why can't both sides be so nice instead of one side being just shredded mulch? Otherwise the landscape plan works nice.
- The yellow building with the corrugated metal at entry – is that the only place the metal is found?
  - It's very unique to the entire project, with the idea of having some subtle keys to direct you to the most likely spot for public access and emphasize that as a focal point.
- Not sure how well that works. Building needs a crown (or a tiara or a headband ☺), it looks institutional. Even a stripe in the material, it needs to be more articulated to where people want to live here. What's the height of the porch?

- The building is approximately 2.5' above the sidewalk on Winnebago. The surrounding landscape is not that low relative to the porch itself.
- It does seem strange that you've got railings on the stairs and then there's no railings on the porch. We were thinking of something very simple.
- At this point simple is out the window.
- I don't necessarily object to doing it simple, but it needs an idiom that is not here.
- The roof on the porch looks flimsy.
  - I think that the presentation tonight does not have that level of detail yet.
- In order for me to support this project I would need to see a lot more. It should not look like low-income housing, it's not fair and it's a disservice to the whole community. I would challenge you to make these buildings more interesting and make them places people want to be.
- If we move initial that approves the massing and site plan.

A motion was made by Asad, seconded by O'Kroley, to refer the project. Asad noted the flimsiness of the materials, flatness of the elevations, use of materials, and that the buildings don't complement each other. Further discussion noted that the general bulk, site plan and massing of the buildings are approvable, but the Commission's collective concerns have to be addressed while still allowing the applicant to go to the Plan Commission. The motion to refer was withdrawn.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion passed on a vote of (6-0).

The motion provided for more developed definitions and details when the project returns. Articulation and detail needs thoughtful consideration.

A previous motion by Asad, seconded by O'Kroley, to **REFER** consideration of this item was withdrawn by unanimous consent.