

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** June 12, 2019

TITLE: 1314, 1318, 1326 E. Washington Avenue –
New Development of a Mixed-Use
Building Containing Ground Floor
Veterans Service Provider with 59
Apartments Above Located in UDD No. 8.
2nd Ald. Dist. (52084) **REFERRED:**
REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: June 12, 2019 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Cliff Goodhart, Jessica Klehr, Tom DeChant, Rafeeq Asad, Syed Abbas, Shane Bernau, Christian Harper and Craig Weisensel.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 12, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. Registered on behalf of the project were Mark Smith and Nicole Solheim, both representing Gorman & Company. The team reviewed changes to the plans since their appearance at the Commission on October 24, 2018. The biggest change is the push back of the 6th floor on E. Washington Avenue, leaving the overall height the same but making the building appear 5-stories rather than six. The building has become more modern in style with projecting bays, a darker base, burnished material, brick at the upper levels in a lighter tone (similar to what is in the neighborhood). The backside has townhouse residential units with a 20-foot backyard and an 8-foot wood fence. Three dimensional views from E. Washington Avenue were shown, one from Pasqual's and one from the parking lot, which is anticipated to be built on in the near future. The E. Washington Avenue façade and streetscape show bicycle parking and landscaping.

The Commission discussed the following:

- What is the treatment along the wall down E. Washington Avenue?
 - It's a different type of masonry with faux openings and a slight indent at 8-inches.
- The elevations say louvers.
 - There will be louvers above the walls but not in them. The wall is a different brick color, the elevation is pointing to the wrong thing.
- Regarding the metal panel, we saw some metal panels on our bus tour that we are not happy with. (The team walked through the metal panel locations). Is it an example of the panel material?
 - Only for finish, but this is not the actual panel.
- The actual metal panes we've been seeing, some are quite awful. We want to see the actual material that will go up and understand the quality of that material.
- We want to understand the gauge and installation method.
- Even the louver profile, we need clarification on where the locations are (some are noted in error on the elevations).

- This is a lot of materials approved. It looks like the majority is masonry, you want to go modern but it looks industrial with brick and metal panel. There is a lot going on for a building like this, it could be the proportions. Maybe go with all brick, a different color.
- There are a lot of industrial buildings in that area.
- What led to the decision to have the drive and parking stalls where they are rather than flipped?
 - Site constraints. We're trying to put a lot of program on it. We have to provide fire access land, share with parking rather than duplicate. Fire Department access has to be closer to the building, and there is a parking access drive in the middle.
- Regarding the playground, the trees appear to be on neighboring properties. I'd like to see at least one shade tree within the playground.
 - The plan shows two Amalanchers on the E. Washington Avenue side.
- Thinking a shade tree rather than ornamental.
 - That would be a good location.
- Avoid planting Ornamental Pear trees. The three in the patio space should be replaced with similar statue tree. Suggest Serviceberry or Horse Chestnut, or smaller Maples (State Street, Astria, Gingkoes).
- Explain the pedestrian scale materials in the patio space.
 - Concrete walks, bike parking, filled in with large scale pavers.
- Is the furniture fixed?
 - Some fixed frames at the entry, the rest is suggested, not sure what the commercial use is.
- What are the raised annual planters made of?
 - Masonry, not wood or timbers.
- The three trees, it's important that is a decent sized tree grate, not 4-feet, at least 4' X 8'.
- What stormwater management strategies are you proposing for this project on the Isthmus?
 - Currently the site is impervious, we're reducing it to 79%. We're placing large 5-foot diameter culverts underneath the parking area, 120-foot pipe to store and detain. These are the only two steps we can take on the site, we're doing what we can. The groundwater is very high on the site. We're not putting in a basement or any underground parking.
- Did the redesign go before the neighborhood?
 - We did have a neighborhood association meeting in May and got input on the previous design. We had more materials and the neighborhood asked us to simplify it. The new design reflects feedback from the neighborhood. We reduced the massing impact and scale to fit within the neighborhood.
- Which are louvers and which are mislabeled?
 - Active are on the west and south, associated with parking and service spaces, passive movement of air. The vertical louver on E. Washington is an intake for residential units.
- The parking on second floor, is that open or glazed in?
 - A combination of glass and opaque panel, mechanically ventilated parking.
- Is the horizontal mullion at wheel level?
 - The headlights are a foot below the opaque panel, there is also a drive aisle on the interior of the E. Washington Avenue side.
- The rear corner rendering, the original design was simpler. Redesign with horizontal siding, more restraint on how materials are placed, more in spirit of the original design (elegant proportions).
 - We're trying to keep higher quality materials on E. Washington, as well as the first couple floor materials. The middle areas, do you want the metal pulled around? Maybe eliminate one material, get back down to 3 materials?
- Yes, maybe a little?
- Are all the soffits the same or do they transition between the base?
 - All the same.

- What's happening on the roof of the interior courtyard?
 - We may have some sedum trays but it won't be occupied.
- What about mechanical equipment?
 - We're trying to put it all up top. We have a low number of a/c condensers.
- Some are shown on the roof, please clarify.
- The E. Washington (south) elevation was more defined with narrow taller bays. This is different and blocker. Is there a way to continue that up from the brick? The ins and outs on the first floor, carry that up on the brick, make the south elevation elegant and urban.
 - Given the current layout we can't go back to that façade.
- I wonder about the verticality to that base with a block on it.
 - We were looking at the Lyric, base and then 3-6, more of a podium.
- How far do the bays stick out?
 - Around 3-feet.
- On the north elevation, the entrance to the units facing the nursery, what is prowed and what is pushed back? The brick is in front of metal panel, the siding is back from the face of brick. The metal panel goes over the brick as well – why? That part looks strange to me, the brick should be more prominent, now it's reduced to a fill-in. It shouldn't have metal panel going around it. Get rid of the inset of darkened siding and make the whole thing brick, bring it up to the roofline.
 - It is possible, but difficult to have brick at the prow. The step becomes problematic, we could try metal in the background.
- You're doing the opposite of what you're doing on other façades. It works on other parts.
 - Would you like to see it reversed?
- Maybe simplified, don't want to reverse, then the metal becomes too prominent. Or make the whole element brick with siding insets? A smaller element could afford to be brick with an inset.
 - It may fall under lines of budget item.
- I would prefer to see brick at the base level rather than in the back at the courtyard level.
 - We were worried about having too much siding facing the residential areas.
- The north elevation of the courtyard has a blank there.
- I'm not comfortable with final approval without further study of the materials. There is a lot going on, this could be better simplified. Those materials, how they are used and where they are placed, I'm not comfortable.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Klehr, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (9-1-0) with Harper voting no and Wagner non-voting. The motion to refer noted the following:

- Provide elevation drawing views of all courtyard façades.
- Provide more detail on materials and their transitions, including projecting element soffits (the Commissioners wanted to better understand the metal panel gauge and installation methods).
- Consider simplifying the material palette.
- Provide more information on roof plan, including any landscaped areas and rooftop mounted mechanical equipment.