

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: September 4, 2019

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

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: September 4, 2019

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 4, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a multi-family addition to the Planned Town Center located at 6810 Milwaukee Street. Registered in support were Brian Munson and Eric Maring, both representing KCG Development; and Matt Gilhooly. Munson reviewed site changes and architecture updates. They substituted landscape species as per the Commission’s previous comments. The bike parking has been accommodated into all the buildings as well as the site and will meet all the requirements. The materials are now a more traditional red brick for base with an increased height of the base to the first floor level. They changed the siding color to a more traditional blue color with a tan accent piece. The rooflines have been simplified between the façades to create more bookend massing with accent pieces at the ends. They kept some architectural details but more as an accent rather than putting them everywhere on the building. The townhome building is still slightly different with less brick but relates in siding color. They are at a 1 to 1 ratio for underground parking, with a 1.75 to 1 ratio as a whole. This is designed for residents that will have vehicles. Munson noted two neighborhood parks within walking distance of the proposed development.

The Secretary read comments from Ald. Lemmer for the record.

- While the project includes a lot of parking, I would ask that you do not ask for it to be reduced. There is little transit or amenities in this area and this amount of parking is ideal for the number of units and mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedrooms.
- Indoor and outdoor structures and activities for children and green space is critical. There is a park not far away but it’s not ideal for sending young children. A community garden would be a nice touch as well.
- Several residents sent feedback regarding the size of the buildings and the importance that these match the look of the neighboring community. Please take this feedback into consideration.
- I appreciate the use of stone in the exterior design of this project, and any opportunities to maximize the size of the windows would also be beneficial.

- As mentioned at the previous meeting, while not related to design, the recent community meeting for this project did not go well and I have serious concerns about the lack of amenities and transit in this location.

Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- It's still busy. The datum lines on the small buildings should relate better to the townhomes. The materials aren't consistent across all of them.
- Something is off where pilasters change to columns, then solid brick to a very thin material. It's a weird transition going from very heavy to very light.
- I'm having a hard time understanding the elements on the ends. It seems like it draws more attention rather than pull around. Down or up, or both.
 - The solution would be to beef that up and make it an accent that wraps the corner.
- It struck me as unsupported.
- What is your plan for amenities?
 - We are planning a full array of amenities: fitness center, business center and large community room. We are working with utilities to determine the size of the playground.
- I prefer to have a project close to a bus route. I like to see car charging stations, if you have 400+ stalls there should be some that are EV charging or EV ready.
- Which amenity is more important: parking or open space? Those parking stall will have a legacy there, even if transit catches up. I think there is too much surface parking. I think the Meadowlands Master Plan does not call for so much parking.
- Building #1 is deficient in parking; if you remove one aisle and reduce one loop you could increase the greenspace north of Building #1.
- I would recommend you have a public meeting to discuss the design and get some feedback and then come back.
 - We did have a neighborhood meeting entirely focused on affordability, and opposition to affordability from the neighborhood. We attempted to present some design components but that was not the interest of the conversation that night. We have extended the timeline for the Plan Commission to allow additional conversations. (Munson then discussed details of the Sprecher Neighborhood Plan and the Meadowlands Master Plan.)
- I'd like to reiterate simplification of the exterior design. The building needs a lot of work so there are cohesive compositions. Bring some of the rationality of the simple floor plans, less need to find something "interesting," and really look at elements that are recessed vs. forward, the composition of bays, what areas have thick rooflines and what areas have thin rooflines.

ACTION:

On a motion by Asad, seconded by Bernau, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (9-0). The motion provided for design and parking revisions.