

To the members of the UDC:

I will not be attending tonight's review of Wingra Point II because I am away on vacation. I wish to go on record however as opposing this project and reminding the Commission of the following:

1) All of the plans pertaining to Park Street--and you yourself as a Commission--have repeatedly stressed the significant nature of the building to be constructed on the site at Fish Hatchery and South Park Street. Planning documents, Commission, the community, all call for the building to be erected at this site to be outstanding in design and execution. The proposed plans for Wingra Point II do not satisfy this call.

2) The plans pertaining to Park Street are not overruled by the new GDP and the PD for this site. In fact, both the documents that were filed when this new zoning for this site was approved by the Common Council and the documents filed for the SIP for the site in question make repeated references to these past planning documents--whose requirements it is clear that the GDP, PD, and SIP must satisfy.

3) The PD for this site allows for a building taller than 7 stories, but does not require it. In fact documents rezoning this site--as well as UDD7 guidelines--state clearly that extra stories are not a given and should be allowed only when and if the architectural merit of the proposed building is sufficient to warrant them.

Throughout your many reviews of Wingra Point II, you have clearly stated your disappointment with the designs for this proposed development both as individuals and as a Commission. In fact when the Plan Commission met to deliberate the proposed plans for WP II, they began by citing the UDC's mediocre assessment of these plans.

You have compared this process of WP II review to the process of reviewing the Ideal and have continued to express disappointment with the design of the Ideal. Please do not throw in the towel for a second time in recent history on a Park Street development.

Please do not approve a less-than-outstanding Wingra Point II. There is no downside to waiting for better plans. There is a serious downside to approving a development that is less than excellent for many years to come.

The City of Madison deserves better.

The gateway to the University deserves better.

Bay Creek and nearby communities deserve better than Wingra Point II.

Sincerely,

Carrie Rothburd

From: todd@barnettarchitecture.com [<mailto:todd@barnettarchitecture.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2015 11:50 AM

To: Martin, Alan

Subject: Park Street Project Comments

Al-

I hope you are doing well.

A colleague just asked me my opinion of the proposal for the Park Street and Fish Hatchery project...and I took a look. This is the first time I have seen a project since my days...years...on UDC and felt compelled to share my thoughts. Please share as appropriate as part of tonight's meeting.

First, I am very excited to see the project move forward. This open space is begging for development of some type. Specific comments (and I will try to keep it limited!):

1. Basic site plan of buildings fronting the street is spot on.
2. Street level uses make great sense - commercial, live-work and residential.
3. Appreciate that residential units appear to be designed to suit adjacency to the parking garage (unlike the townhouses at Hilldale, for example).
4. Quality materials.

and my area of concern...

5. This is an incredibly important site in ways that everyone is aware and the architecture needs to respond appropriately. I am concerned that the architecture appears to be more of the same that we see everywhere - this is not to say bad but rather there are some places in Madison which call for something...special.

First and foremost, I see no reason (and I offer this with a grain of salt since I have not been at any of the meetings...Neighborhood, City, UDC, etc.) that the flatiron building can't read as one building. Yes, this is a big building but I do not believe that adding a layer of brick to one face is needed...rather it is not needed. It is a big building but see no need to try to make it look like two buildings (and if you do, a nominal 1' projection doesn't do it justice). Kennedy Place on Atwood is a good example of a big building reading as one and doing it well (and Randy's Depot)...I'm not worried that it can't be done. And if you were going to try to make it look like two different buildings would you change the window patterns? What about instead using the brick as a base course element and setting the lighter and more contemporary metal on top? These are just "small" ideas...

Would it make sense to make the flatiron building taller and one of the other buildings shorter? Not sure about this...but wondering. It's at the north end of the site and wouldn't block light into the roof court (which is a great feature).

The non-flatiron buildings might and can read more like background buildings but perhaps with a different character and identity than the flatiron. What about something truly contemporary? Is this building about the future...if so let the building's architecture be part of that idea.

Choice of stone for the columns at the point of the flatiron might be studied. They seem quite large and make the entry appear uninviting.

Let the flatiron be the **GEM**.

If you are going to change the flatiron into "two" buildings wouldn't it make sense to make the change at the edge of the first floor commercial space...locating the split artificially removes integrity.

I'll stop...if you can believe it.

Thank you - all - for your efforts.

Todd

Todd Barnett, ALA

Barnett Architecture LLC

118 North Breese Terrace Suite I

Madison, WI 53726-4133

P 608.233.4538

todd@barnettarchitecture.com

www.barnettarchitecture.com

