

## AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** August 14, 2019

TITLE: 6810 Milwaukee Street, 1 Windstone Drive, 2 Windstone Drive, 45 Windstone Drive and 46 Windstone Drive – PD, Multi-Family Addition to the Planned Town Center for 222-Units. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ald. Dist. (54624)

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

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

DATED: August 14, 2019      **ID NUMBER:**

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of August 14, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a multi-family addition to a Planned Town Center located at 6810 Milwaukee Street, 1 Windstone Drive, 2 Windstone Drive, 45 Windstone Drive and 46 Windstone Drive. Registered in support of the project were Brian Munson and Eric Maring, representing KCG Development; and Jim Hovde. Munson reviewed the overall site and context within the larger development which contains four multi-family buildings and one townhome. Utility locations are impacting site building placements. The project spans from 3-4 story buildings and they anticipate it including affordable housing. They have changed from a sloped roof form to a flat roof structure and increased the scale of windows. The base is stone with accent stone in the balcony support columns. They have focused on the corner, which wasn't previously fully developed and are trying to keep the materials simple.

Ald. Lemmer spoke, noting her appreciation for the exterior design. She has heard from residents that they want to make sure the setbacks are enough, and that this works with adjacent buildings and in the area. This area is rather isolated for affordable housing, there is little within walking distance with the nearest grocery store two miles away, public transportation is very limited and this site needs parking.

Jim Hovde spoke to the team's commitment to the east side where they saw a differential in growth. The City zoned this as medium density multi-family, this project is no different than a market-rate deal, 10-15% less income. Madison has great bus service and when it expands it will improve. Buses expand after developments. The prior Alder was in favor of this proposal, the Mayor supports affordable housing. This is an excellent project.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Is there any flex space option here?

- No, the Comprehensive Plan and neighborhood plans have identified this as medium density residential.
- The west portion of the site will be a town center with commercial uses. The project to the west is mixed-use. The challenge of the site is about the small size.
- This design doesn't have the level of refinement, balance and simplicity that we typically like to see. There are single windows, double and then single. Look at successful designs, you'll see simplicity in use of materials and composition of openings, base/middle/top; there's a lot going on here. This has yet to reach a level of continuity of how buildings relate to one another.
- What is the unit count? There is a lot of parking.
  - 216 and 7 townhomes (2-car garages). Parking is at 1.8 stalls per unit, we're trying not to over-park.
- I'm coming up with 2+ cars per unit, that still seems like a lot. I understand the need because this isn't downtown, but it feels like a lot of surface parking.
- The planting scheme seems restrained and nice. There are a couple of species Acer Palmatum we want to avoid, it's invasive. The Pear and other ornamental trees we could swap out and do better. The Potentilla and Burning Bush are lower quality/invasive.
- Make sure bikes have access and parking.
  - We will make sure the bike parking is met.
- Simplicity without a lot of the decorative elements and some consistency. I'm also concerned about the fiber cement panels; some of those don't look that great, when they're larger pieces it adds waves, you see the joints and it really looks cheap. Maybe you could balance or eliminate some of those large panels. Also the starkness of the contrast is a little dreary, it's very dark with a bright contrast, it could be more subtle in the material contrast.
- There are some compositional imbalances, it really needs to be stripped down and looked at with a fresh start.
  - My concern is it gets too stark for affordable housing.
- Not cheap, an elegant design where you don't have to do all these additive things to decorate. Start with nice massing, rhythm and nice restrained material.
- I'm a big proponent of affordable housing not looking like affordable housing, not picking materials based on who is living there. If you look at PR3 and PR4, the parapets seem super high and super thin, it looks fake. Simplifying some of the ups and downs and levels of the datums would help. It doesn't have to be a huge change in materials.
- The façade is long. Your vertical bays are working well at breaking that up. It's hard to decide what details to keep or not keep, but I applaud the little details. The bigger buildings have vertical bays, but the duplexes have a much more horizontal feel. Right now they're very different and don't feel related; the proportions are just so very different.
  - The last time we tried to make them the same and it didn't work. We can look further at ways to make the materials more different.
- The contrast in materials is part of the problem, if you change that it might be the thing that gives you the a-ha moment. If they were more complementary but still contrasting it would be better.
- Sheet PR2, the corner of Building 1 seems to be totally different materials. I like that corner, but it seems so different.
  - That corner has an entry there so we wanted to do something different there.
  - That is the first corner of this development that you will see.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by Goodhart, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0).