

## AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** April 25, 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)

**REFERRED:**  
**REREFERRED:**  
**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Kevin Firchow, Acting Secretary      **ADOPTED:**      **POF:**

DATED: April 25, 2018      **ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Michael Rosenblum, Tom DeChant, Cliff Goodhart, Amanda Hall, Rafeeq Asad, John Harrington, Dawn O’Kroley and Christian Harper.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 25, 2018, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PD(SIP) located at 2507 Winnebago Street for grand family and kinship family housing in two buildings. Registered in support of the project were Mark Smith, Nicole Solheim, Ted Matkom and Ben Marshall, all representing Gorman & Company.

The team presented plans for the 3-story residential buildings for grand families, kinship and multi-generational families. These are 2 and 3-bedroom units with affordable housing rents. Case workers from Lutheran Social Services and a property management team will be on-site. Greenspace and hardscape is provided between the buildings that allows for multiple activities to occur at the same time with a number of landscape features. Both of the primary building entries are off of that plaza. In address of the Commission’s previous concerns, the development team has made the material palette between the two buildings much more similar than dissimilar. However, they have kept the primarily horizontal nature of Building #6, while breaking it down into a series of vertical masses on each end, as well as marking the entry with a vertical piece of a third material, and the large central porch as a primary feature of both buildings. Immediately off the shared porch is the shared community space that serves both of the buildings. That space might also be available for the public to use, with an access from Winnebago Street. The development team has added detail on the street façades to give it a more residential feel, while the design has not changed substantially. The accent brick and base brick on the two buildings are the same. There is some banding on the top, accentuating the cornice line, additional joining, more detailed joints in the stucco, the metal element will be more detailed and crafty with standing seam, and the windows properly recessed into the brick with brick mullions rather than just window framing. Each unit entry has its own stoop. The exposure of panels will be in the 6-8 inch range, so it will be lapped.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- On a building like this you need consistent reveals so that all the boards are the same length.

- Previously the building materials were too distinct and not cohesive enough. Now they appear to be too close but not exact, it gives the appearance that this is a mistake. I like Building #6. I see the effort and attention to details, I'm not sure about the whole entry. But I don't see that same level of detail or progress shown to Building #7. It's really flimsy looking which takes away from the whole porch thing. I don't get the metal thing, I don't think it necessarily works. It doesn't say entry.
  - We were trying to avoid the appearance of an institution. We want to make sure they are not identical. We're also working to make the street as interesting as possible, so we don't want any repeats of any particular style or motif from one building or side of the street to the other.
  - We don't want a "Disneyworld" type town in the middle of a cornfield. We focused on Building #6 because it seemed like everybody was pretty happy with Building #7 last time.
- I agree they have to find an in between but I don't want to see them the same.
- Are those knee brace type things shown under that canopy?
  - Yes, there will be some type of support underneath that element.
- I would almost not do that, it looks applique because it's clearly not structural, it looks odd.
  - The exact element on that piece has not yet been worked out.
- I'm concerned that the renderings, elevations and boards are inconsistent. You don't get a sense of how the design works.
- Regarding the dimension of the posts on the big porch, in that perspective they look a little more substantial than they look in the elevations.
  - We're showing them as 8 x 8 steel tubes. We don't want it big and chunky, we want it open so we chose a minimalist look.
  - This is not about traditional detailing, this is about something that's very sparse, industrial, in keeping with the former use of this site.
- From here they look like 4 x 4s.
- The metal bay – I would either bring it down and have it terminate into the building, or if it's going to bump-out, bring those side walls back so that it has a perceived depth to it. On the other building I can't really tell from the drawings, are the metal bump-outs just parapets that drop down or do they also return?
  - There's an attention to that detail there, there's a game that needs to be played and won as far as how that returns, no question.
- Same with the brick, you'd expect that brick to return back.
  - All that's going to return, we're not going to leave that just hanging out there.
- That would maybe be a comment here so staff can look at that.
- The landscaping plan overall looks good. I have concerns about the Clethra not doing well in hot dry areas. Also concerns with the Red Twig Dogwood. Tweaks in the planting plan would be helpful. Look for a way to get more substantial trees. The beds I wouldn't change, I'd just switch out some plants.
- There should be more variety with the amount of Service Berry. You're also using Ash trees, I'd hate to have that planted and then removed.
- Mountain Ash isn't an Ash tree though.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Asad, seconded by O'Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with O'Kroley, Asad, Hall, DeChant, Rosenblum and Harrington voting yes; Braun-Oddo and Goodhart voting no.