## City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PRESENTED: May 28, 2014

TITLE: 448 South Park Street – PD(GDP-SIP) Six- **REFERRED:** 

Story Mixed-Use Building Including Retail and Residential in UDD No. 7. 13<sup>th</sup> Ald. **REREFERRED:** 

Dist. (27550)

\*Modifications to Previously Approved REPORTED BACK:

Plans\*

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary ADOPTED: POF:

DATED: May 28, 2014 **ID NUMBER:** 

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Melissa Huggins, Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant, Richard Slayton and John Harrington.

## **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 28, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** to modifications to a previously approved PD(GDP-SIP) located at 448 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Joseph Lee and Jeremy Droeszler, representing JD McCormick Companies. Lee presented 3-dimensional elevations showing integration of the HVAC system into the building. They reworked the fiber cement paneling joints on the top floor, coinciding with the grills a bit more on all elevations. Each grill will be painted to match the adjacent material, hidden behind balconies whenever possible. Two colors of utility sized brick will be used. More glass has been added at the ground floor corner to reflect the previously approved plans, making it a more successful corner. They are calling for metal at the ground floor. Lighting and photometric plans were also included in the packets. Changes to the landscape plan in regards to the planters that used to be in front of the building along the street side were done in address to Planning staff comments.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- You need to have some kind of plantings in the parking area.
  - We do have some at the entry canopy.

This is just straight concrete, you need to do something in here. I won't vote for this if it's just going to be concrete (Park Street and portions of the Drake Street frontage).

- These Ajugas, they're going to be walked on. I would put a tough, short growing shrub in there.
- You need taller trees rather than shade trees in the back.
- Your drop-off space I suspect will more often than not be a "parked" space.
- Why don't we do something that makes 2 ½-3 ½' tall ornamental grass that creates a space here. You can still see the retail. This is almost like why bother planting anything. Make a statement with some

landscape material. Something that will separate the sidewalk from the street a bit better. It's not going to block the retail, but it'll soften it along the street.

- From the first time we saw this, to the second time, and now the third, it had lost its industrial look. Do we feel it's back now?
  - o The two brick colors are a big improvement.
- The side Park Street elevation (going down) at the alleyway, we talked about is the one walpak that's not lined up.
  - o They're slightly different unit plans there.
- We don't have detailed signage. Signage should meet Chapter 31 as approved to staff, or return to the Commission.

## **ACTION:**

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (4-0). The motion provided for address of the comments and that the applicant work with the Fire Department to attempt to provide trees within the streetscape with signage to be submitted for staff approval and be code compliant.

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 5.

## URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 448 South Park Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	6	4	-	-	-	6	5
	-	7	4	-	-	5	7	-