

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION**PRESENTED:** May 8, 2013**TITLE:** 1924 Atwood Avenue – PUD(SIP), Fifty-Unit, Four-Story Apartment Building. 6th Ald. Dist. (29294)**REFERRED:****REREFERRED:****REPORTED BACK:****AUTHOR:** Alan J. Martin, Secretary**ADOPTED:****POF:****DATED:** May 8, 2013**ID NUMBER:**

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 8, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(SIP) located at 1924 Atwood Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were J. Randy Bruce, the project architect; and Scott Lewis. Bruce presented changes to the plans to better address the street and railroad tracks. The rotation of some of the mass of the building relates to the rail corridor and provides a bit of interest to the massing on the Atwood Avenue face. The elevations and the material palette were simplified from previous versions; a buff colored masonry is being proposed, using a corrugated metal in dark gray with a red metal fin to define the entry. A small community room/kitchen off the entry to the building will open to the plaza space with planters. Green roof elements were shown with the landscape plan to help define outdoor spaces for the individual units.

Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- The dark color of the canopy piece on the front doesn’t tie in, it almost competes with your strong vertical. You’ve made a great effort on this site in trying to change the form to make it more site-specific. Maybe the articulation could go a bit further, tying the stair to the railroad will be a very nice amenity. Look at upper canopy cornice treatment.
- I like the way the red is special to the bays. This is really nice and elegant, especially in elevation by itself. Maybe just some small columns at the entry would be enough.
- I like the vertical very much. The lower canopy is canted and angled and reemphasizes the twist.
- That top canopy, I’m not quite sure what it’s doing up there. Maybe it’s something in the brick detailing? It adds another layer that almost competes with the other one rather than complementing it.
- Consider removing fin and canopied cornices.
- Push entry under canopy further back and incorporate red side wall.

 **DRAFT**

ACTION:

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Cnare, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0) and noted that the applicants consider and address the canopy/cornice comments.

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 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1924 Atwood Avenue

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

General Comments:

- Suggest removal of upper projection and vertical finish. Also push main entry doors inward.
- Improvements to design, the building to site well, clean, contemporary.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: March 6, 2013

TITLE: 1924 Atwood Avenue – PUD(SIP), Fifty-Unit, Four-Story Apartment Building. 6th Ald. Dist. (29294)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: March 6, 2013

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Melissa Huggins, Henry Lufler, Tom DeChant, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Marsha Rummel and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 6, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a PUD(SIP) located at 1924 Atwood Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were J. Randy Bruce, the project architect; and Scott Lewis. Bruce presented plans for Phase 2 for 50-units in a four-story apartment building. This project is non-age restricted while it’s neighboring property is restricted to ages 55 and older. The site does include a 25-foot stretch that connects to Second Street. Forty-nine parking stalls will be provided with the parking extending beyond both sides of the building. A plaza deck is located on one side with a commons room and apartments, with individual apartments on the other side. The goal is a contemporary building with a mix of colored masonry, some metal while trying to keep the building in scale with the surrounding neighborhood. They are working on the landscape plan as well as community garden plots. The clean water from the roof will go to a bioswale that will run along the greenspace strip as well as provide water for the gardens. Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- I would like to see something that doesn’t look like everything else. Something new and exciting. Metal panels? Go for something different, don’t worry about fit with an identity and doesn’t look like everything else in neighborhood, could be in bold moves in colors and massing. The building as proposed is typical all over town, flip metal panel and masonry.
 - That’s what we’re trying to get to.
- Connect building more to the site with railroad /greenspace including its unique geometry with a building design and landscapes that tie back to the site.
- Repeat projecting bays on building series at an angle with sweeps. Look at first version of Iota Court’s upper sweep as an example for creativity.
- I’m cautious of the Monroe Street experience, and how the neighborhood was involved.
- Could you put trees where the columns are?
- Need relief for blank walls of parking structure.
- There are opportunities for the building material to replicate some sort a shade structure so it’s comfortable.

- Root it in its site and make this different. You have this railroad connection and the greenspace connection to the railroad; see if you can connect your raised plaza by stairs to your greenspace along the tracks. Then plan the idea of the geometry and start playing on that.
- I would encourage a planting strip as a buffer. The source of your bioswale could be whatever overflows from some type of cistern that could be used in the garden. Something that would relate to the building. It expresses to the neighborhood that you're doing something positive, but it would need to relate to the architecture.
- Regarding the building, the red sounds like it's the body and everything else just hangs off this red that runs end to end, like a skeleton almost with all the other material would hang from that.
- Look at the second and third floor railings, what if they were articulated differently?

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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 ratings for this project is 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1924 Atwood Avenue

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

General Comments:

- Has potential to be very distinguished with some work.
- Consider incorporating a cistern, for water in the garden plots, the cistern could overflow to the bioswale.