

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: LANDMARKS COMMISSION	PRESENTED: February 16, 2015
TITLE: 114 N. Bedford Street – Multi-family Housing Adjacent to a Landmark – Doyle Administration Building, 4 th Ald. District. Contact: Melissa Huggins (36432)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Amy Scanlon, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: February 16, 2015	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Stu Levitan, Chair; Erica Fox Gehrig, Vice Chair; Christina Slattery, Jason Fowler, David McLean, Marsha Rummel, and Michael Rosenblum. Rummel; arrived at 5:30 p.m. during discussion of Item 2 and Fowler left at 6:15 p.m. during discussion of Item 4.

SUMMARY:

Chris Johnson, representing CA Ventures, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Tom Chinnock, representing CA Ventures, registering in support and wishing to speak. Chinnock briefly introduced the project and how the proposed development will be compatible with the existing context. He explained the exterior views and how the massing and materials relate to the context and the adjacent landmark building.

Levitan asked that Chinnock address the comments in the staff report. Chinnock explained that the larger brick size helps reduce the overall building mass and scale and provides a cost savings. He explained that the project team chose to use the articulation detail found on the Doyle building on the brick areas of the proposed development; that the actual wood siding would be replaced with a siding product that would relate to the residential context; that the townhome rhythm would be enhanced by making the front doors a prominent yellow color; that the landscape elements will be curved as presented; and that the project team didn't feel that the canopy element was necessary.

Rosenblum asked what staff would prefer as the material in lieu of siding. Staff explained that brick is preferable, but metal or composite panel could be considered as long as it did not have a wood grain and did not try to emulate traditional horizontal lapped or beveled siding.

There was general discussion by Gehrig and Rosenblum that the project was not so large or visually intrusive. McLean explained that the project may not be so large, but that it may be visually intrusive. McLean explained that the top and bottom of the building do not work together and that the vertical brick articulation was not compatible with the rest of the design which may be contributing to this visual intrusiveness. Levitan explained that the ordinance language says "or" not "and". McLean acknowledged the difference.

There was general discussion about the prominence of the elevation as viewed from the Kohl Center parking lot. Johnson explained that there has been discussion about the UW Arts building being located in that parking lot.

Slattery explained that the building size seemed acceptable adjacent to the landmark building.

Sara Tocci, representing CA Ventures, registering in support and wishing to speak.

Ryan Sadow, representing CA Ventures, registering in support and available to answer questions.

Melissa Huggins, representing CA Ventures, registering in support and available to answer questions.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Rosenblum, seconded by Gehrig, to recommend to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission that the project is not so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjoining landmark. The motion passed on a vote of (4:1). Ayes: Fowler, Gehrig, Slattery, Rosenblum. Nays: McLean. Levitan does not vote. Rummel was not present.

Levitan asked that the Commission discuss the design comments in the staff report. Gehrig expressed concern about moving the comments forward. McLean and Levitan felt it was important to let the other Commissions know that the Landmarks Commission had strong feelings about the design adjacent to the landmark building. There was general discussion about the design comments in the staff report.

Levitan explained that he was pleased that the staff report separated the ordinance related issues from the design issues even though the issues are interrelated.

A motion was made by McLean, seconded by Rosenblum, to include the design comments from the staff report and the related discussion in the recommendation to the Plan Commission and Urban Design Commission. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

PLANNING DIVISION STAFF REPORT

February 16, 2015

PREPARED FOR THE LANDMARKS COMMISSION



Project Name/Address: 114 N Bedford Street
Application Type: New development adjacent to designated landmark site
Legistar File ID # 36432
Prepared By: Amy L. Scanlon, Preservation Planner, Planning Division
Date Prepared: February 5, 2015

Summary

Project Applicant/Contact: Melissa Huggins
Requested Action: The Applicant is requesting an advisory recommendation for the proposed new development and its impact on the adjacent landmark site.

Background Information

Parcel Location: The subject site is located on North Bedford Street adjacent to the designated landmark Washington Public Grade and Orthopedic School.

Relevant Landmarks Ordinance Sections:

28.144 DEVELOPMENT ADJACENT TO A LANDMARK OR LANDMARK SITE.

Any development on a zoning lot adjoining a landmark or landmark site for which Plan Commission or Urban Design Commission review is required shall be reviewed by the Landmark Commission to determine whether the proposed development is so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjoining landmark or landmark site. Landmark Commission review shall be advisory to the Plan Commission and the Urban Design Commission.

Analysis and Conclusion

Adjacent to the development site (114 N Bedford Street) is the designated landmark Washington Public Grade and Orthopedic School (545 W Dayton Street) also known as the Doyle Administration Building. The Landmarks Commission was given an informational presentation on December 15, 2014. The Landmarks Commission is now tasked with providing a recommendation to the Plan Commission and the Urban Design Commission based on whether the proposed project is so large or visually intrusive as to adversely affect the historic character and integrity of the adjoining landmark.

While staff believes that this proposal meets that broad standard, staff feels that there are some modest design changes that would result in a better overall visual relationship with the adjacent landmark. Those changes include:

- Reduce the size of the brick.
The utility size does not relate to the landmark building or the general context.
- Simplify the vertical brick articulation of the lower levels.
The proposed brick treatment accentuates a vertical quality of the base of the building. The project team explained that vertical articulation detail was derived from the Doyle Building and proposed as a way to relate the architecture of the landmark to the new development. The vertical panel elements on

the Doyle Building are located on the center of the front façade as a focal point or as design features that indicate the entrance doors. The typical treatment of the Doyle Building brick is flush and taut with curved corners which are characteristics of the Art Moderne Style. The overall expression of the landmark building is horizontal. The treatment of brick on the proposed development does not seem to relate to the Doyle Building and the vertical articulation creates an increased feeling of height at the lower levels.

- Remove the “wood siding” at the lower level of the town house units.
Wood, used in this manner, is not allowed by the zoning code. The material choice alone does not make the townhomes relate to the adjacent residential context. The “wood siding” or the connotation of traditional horizontal siding seems out of place on this building. The townhomes should relate to the context through massing and their relationship to the street and not rely on the material to differentiate the difference in housing types.
- Enhance townhouse rhythm on Bedford Street.
The individual townhouses should be better articulated and their entrances should be more prominent to better relate to the established residential context.
- Curve the landscape elements that follow the curve of the glass walls at the first level.
Curving the landscape elements to relate to the curved glass walls of the lobbies will reinforce and accentuate the design elements. Paving patterns could also reinforce the curved walls.
- Add a canopy element at the lobby on northeast corner.
Adding a canopy to the northeast corner that is similar to the canopy on the southeast corner will visually and physically terminate the “hanging brick” of the upper stories.

Recommendation

Staff believes that the proposed development is not so large and visually intrusive that it adversely affects the historic character and integrity of the adjoining landmark and recommends that the Landmarks Commission provide this advisory recommendation to the Plan Commission and the Urban Design Commission. In addition, staff recommends that the design suggestions in this report be forwarded to the Urban Design Commission and Plan Commission for further consideration.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: March 11, 2015

TITLE: 114 North Bedford Street – New
Development in the UMX District, 185-
Unit Housing Project. 4th Ald. Dist.
(36188)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: March 11, 2015

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Melissa Huggins* Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant, Lauren Cnare, Cliff Goodhart and John Harrington.

Huggins recused herself on this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 11, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** for new development in the UMX District for a 185-unit housing project located at 114 North Bedford Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Ryan Sadowy, Tom Chinnock, Joe Herzog and Chris Johnson, representing CA Ventures; and Joe Porter, representing Ken Saiki Design. They are proposing a larger brick dimension to create a civic scale with breaks in the brick where windows are aligning vertically and read as almost one continuous window element. Within these reveals the metal above would match with the frame colors of the windows. A dynamic pedestrian experience on the street includes raised planters that undulate as you walk along Bedford Street, with bike parking along Mifflin Street and small ornamental trees. The bioswale has been removed due to City Engineering restrictions. Two colors of metal panels are proposed that allow for shifting in color, as well as composite wood. Planning staff feels most of the Urban Design Guidelines for this project have been met. Heather Stouder did bring attention to the landscaping; the details haven’t been provided yet on the terrace landscaping, recognizing that the area will be shadowed the majority of the time. The overall amount of glass will remain the same with exact window details to be provided in the future.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- What is the color of the mortar?
 - It will lean more towards uniformity than highly contrast. The mortar should not be contrasting but match the brick color.
- My strong preference is to go to the modular brick. It always looks better, more elegant. I’ve seen really big buildings with modular brick for all different uses and it gives it an extra level of detail and quality, versus utility brick with is usually done for the sake of economy.
- I concur that the larger brick is generally a cost saving measure. A modular brick would be a finer, more appropriate at a pedestrian scale with a running bond.

- Being suspended as a panelized system is absolutely what this building is about, so I concur that the addition of a canopy wouldn't be a necessity.
- Generally I like the building. In general the placement of plantings is fine, but look at your species. The landscaping isn't on par with the architecture, ho-hum. Look at different species, Serviceberry versus Muscledwood, question Kentucky Coffee tree and need to see the terrace species before final approval.
- What are your thoughts on the coping detail?
 - We wanted to follow the profile as much as possible, so right now with the systems we have in place, there will probably be 5 or 6-inch difference between the brick and metal panel. We would like the coping to follow that but we weren't planning on capping it or anything like that. The goal would be not to see it.
- Comparing it to one of the neighboring buildings, if you can keep this light and feel like the brick is hitting the sky, it would be a successful contrast.
 - I believe Amy (Landmarks Commission) said that cap on Doyle is not part of the original...not something to emulate.
- Needs to be minimal, to not see, knife-edge minimal
- To me the base of the building is taller, the height has been accentuated. It happens to be similar to the neighbor, as long as it's in a much more modern dialogue it could be fine. It's how it meets the sky.
- Is that wood composite material allowable?
 - (Stouder) Yes it's allowable. Staff still has some concerns with it as a base material, but it's definitely allowable. It's not a code issue, it's a preference issue. What's staff concern on it? One of the concerns, mostly raised by the Historic Preservation Planner and the Landmarks Commission is that it's another material, it's almost an accent used at the base, and overall simplification of materials, there was the thinking that that would be the first one to go. This is an opportunity to simplify the palette, and to give a strong enough base for the building.
- I would say that given the color and uniformity, it's not trying to look like wood, it has a wood-like texture so I think it's appropriate. I don't see that it's going to be anything more than an accent.
- On the north elevation, your side lights are not below the metal panel, take a look at that; transom instead of sidelight.
- The detailing of the cement board drawings was brought up in the staff report.
 - We haven't discussed that.
- Is it going to be a reveal?
 - It'll be a reveal with a metal joint. It'll look like a shadow reveal at around 1/4" but not shiny.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0). The motion provided that modular brick be used in a running bond as a base material for the lower four-stories, accepting the rounded corner without a canopy, with landscaping concerns addressed and to return to the landscape architects for approval.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall rating for this project is 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 114 North Bedford Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	8	7	8	-	8	9	8

General Comments:

- Nice to see a project that breaks the mold.

5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: March 11, 2015

TITLE: 114 North Bedford Street – New
Development in the UMX District, 185-
Unit Housing Project. 4th Ald. Dist.
(36188)
*Comprehensive Design Review, Signage
Package*

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: March 11, 2015

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Melissa Huggins, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant, Lauren Cnare, Cliff Goodhart and John Harrington.

Huggins recused herself on this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 11, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a signage package located at 114 North Bedford Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Mary Beth Growney Selene, representing Ryan Signs, Inc.

This item was approved as a consent item with the finding that all applicable standards are adequately addressed.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by O’Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0).

Stouder, Heather

From: Tim Kamps
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2015 4:00 PM
To: Martin, Alan; Stouder, Heather
Cc: Peggy LeMahieu; Martin, Dennis; Peter Ostlind
Subject: neighborhood comments on CA Ventures Bedford St proposal

The W Mifflin Neighborhood development steering committee appreciates the high level of collaboration and thoughtful incorporation of our feedback by the CA Ventures, Bedford St. development team. The professional courtesy shown to the neighborhood steering committee by its early involvement in the process, carefully listening to its comments for improvement of the project, and great written and verbal communication with the neighborhood steering committee assisted in achieving the best development proposal for the neighborhood area based on zoning rules for the area.

CA Ventures made many adjustments to the design of the project to make it unique in architecture while fitting in with the Education Administration building and Bedford and W Mifflin St neighborhoods. They have been sensitive to the landscape design to enhance the pedestrian flow and open space on the roof top areas. The company held two neighborhood meetings; explaining the concept and design as well as listening to their concerns.

There are two items of interest to the neighborhood which had not been fully designed as of our last meeting. The first is the provision of bike parking at the exterior of the building for visitors. Bike parking should be adjacent to the entries to the building to insure that it is functional. In particular the need for bike parking at the northeast entry along Bedford St. should be considered. The second item of interest is the material which will be used for screening the openings into the parking garage. This material should provide visual interest and limit sight lines into the garage and light spillage from the garage to the exterior at night.

A concern voiced by a few citizens involved with the project is its size and density. Though this may be a legitimate concern, the city has zoned the area at the size and density of this proposed project. We feel the proposal meets the "unique" requirement for the additional level of the building.



Overall, we feel that the project meets our expectations for development in the neighborhood.