

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** January 29, 2020

**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. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ald. Dist. (54624)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Janine Glaeser, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** January 29, 2020

**ID NUMBER:**

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of January 29, 2020, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a multi-family addition located at 6810 Milwaukee Street, 1 Wind Stone Drive, 2 Wind Stone Drive, 45 Wind Stone Drive and 46 Wind Stone Drive. Registered and speaking in support was Brian Munson, representing KCG Development. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Eric Maring and Mo McKae, both representing KCG Development; and Matt Gilhooly.

Munson reviewed changes since their last presentation, including raised community gardens adjacent to the play area, removal of four parking stalls in the parking lot of Building 1 to increase planting areas and give additional areas for greenspace around the building. A majority of the discussion was looking at the exterior architecture and building materials as the Commission felt the building was too busy. They are using a very simple color palette with simple detailing for the balconies, playing with the width of the bump-outs and color, keeping the datum lines for the main façade and the pop up elements. The stone and window fenestrations are also kept simple. The townhome buildings are 2-stories and a different type of structure, kept simple with the same color palette and changed porch element to tie into the other buildings.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Are all the windows the same size on the buildings?
  - We have a single slider that's the same, and at the balconies we have either a double slider or swing door with side lights.
- Some of your punched openings are very, very small.
  - I think it's a 54" x 54" window, I think it's average size. The living space as the 7-foot slider space.
- When you simplified, something about the windows looks like jail windows. The trim is not working, something about the size of the punched openings.

- Sliders make it look smaller, more institutional.
  - They're larger than what we typically specify at 54" x 54".
- Maybe it's the proportion of windows against the field they're in. The façade is pretty flat and it makes the windows look like small squares. I would question the level of detail as being too simple now. There's great interest around the balconies but four-stories of identical windows on that façade, it might need more review. The windows look small against the background. Maybe a band or something.
- I had the exact thought. Very institutional. They're floating in space too much, the need to be pulled together with some kind of detail, at least vertically or the two horizontally, pull them together into one element so they don't float in this big space that gives repetition of punched openings.
  - We attempted that kind of thing on Building 5 with some panel details. That's what we had on the last go-round and it was too much at that point. I think we're open to suggestions but we had some of that detailing and trim work on the last iteration and it was too much.
- Maybe it's not anything too high of a contrast, a trim work that helps keep them from floating so independently.
  - Is the concern more so on this single element compared to the ends where you have more of the building architecture breaking up the elements?
- I'm wondering if it's maybe OK in a limited area.
  - I'm trying to find ways to verbalize what you're looking for. Some trim detailing around paired windows or groups of three, are you thinking more horizontal or vertical?
- The multi-family has verticals.
- This looks like a modern version of the projects, because of the windows. Institutional squares every five-feet and it diminishes the entire design. You don't notice the pushing and pulling because of those.
- Having a different sized window in the bedroom might make a difference.
- Because there is horizontality to these compositions, turning those windows on their sides, there's something disjointed about that.
- I appreciate the gestures you made to address some of our site comments. We don't often see double-wide islands. The islands are not a great spot for the Red Oak, you could swap it for a White Oak, Swamp Oak or Kentucky Coffee tree to do better in the heat.
- I'm happy to see you have an area for raised planter beds. I don't know what the demand is for that, if your potential tenants would use that. Kudos for starting off with the effort of it. The playground is good as the nearest park is a ways away. It does look pretty modest in size but perhaps it could be expanded further. I'll make the same comments on tree species. Good luck with the white Rhododendron, they may not get the maintenance they need. If you want a spring flowering shrub you could look at Little Leaf Lilacs, those are pretty bulletproof.
  - We will heed the local experts' advice.
- Are your balconies wood framed?
  - Yes.
- Treat the underside of those, stain it to match the face.
  - We talked about a soffit drainage system to it'll all be covered.
- I do appreciate the simplification, including the window comments, I see improvements.
  - Is that something we could work on staff about?
- We granted initial way back in September. They've been through the Plan Commission and Common Council. The PC approval is conditioned on our final approval and keeping the playground in the site plan.
- I would be comfortable because we already see how you've addressed that in the other building.
- (Ald. Lemmer) Casey has responded to all the community feedback provided previously such as maximizing greenspace and adding community gardens. I appreciate the discussion on window sizes, they should be bigger. The materials and colors look really good, the siding is brighter than previously.

There will be a lot of families living here so the playground is very important. Door Creek Park is close by and you don't have to cross busy streets, but you wouldn't send small children there alone. Most of the apartments over here are dog friendly, if there can be dog waste receptacles that would be good.

A motion was made by Braun-Oddo, seconded by Weisensel to grant final approval. Discussion continued as follows:

- (Firchow) We do have a Council approval that shows the window pattern. I think there can be flexibility but I'm concerned about the amount of openings.
- I'll amend the motion noting window change alternative to go back to the original windows.
- That's a lot to put on staff in terms of window size/type/location.
- We're not changing window locations.
- The alternative is to go back to what the window size was in the initial approval version, but simplify materials and composition.
- It just seems like a lot to send back to staff.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by Weisensel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-2) with Asad and Klehr voting no. The motion noted the following:

- Take into account tying up the windows together, possibly similar to the townhouse building.
- Suggest different type or detailing around the windows so it looks less institutional.
- Change tree species in the tree islands as suggested (Swamp Red Oak for a White Oak, Swamp Oak or Kentucky Coffee tree).
- Treat the underside of the decks.
- Go back to the "initial approval" window size and simplify the materials and composition.
- Consider further expanding the playground.