



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**Project Address:** 999 S Park Street  
**Application Type:** New Mixed-Use Building in Urban Design District (UDD) 7  
**UDC is an Approving Body**  
**Legistar File ID #:** [90917](#)  
**Prepared By:** Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

## Background Information

**Applicant | Contact:** Michael Carlson, Threshold Development

**Project Description:** The applicant is proposing to construct a four-story, mixed-use building with approximately 2,900 square feet of commercial space and 54 residential units. The project will be served by 30 enclosed parking spaces.

**Project Schedule:**

- UDC received an Informational Presentation on December 3, 2025.
- UDC granted Initial Approval on February 4, 2026.

**Approval Standards:** The UDC is an **approving body** on this request. The site is located in Urban Design District 7 ("UDD 7"), which requires that the Urban Design Commission review the proposed project using the design standards and guidelines for that district in [MGO Section 33.24\(14\)](#).

As noted above, at the February 4, 2026, meeting, the UDC granted Initial Approval of this item with conditions. Initial Approval signifies that generally the Commission is able to find that the proposed building placement and massing is consistent with the review and approval criteria, but that additional architectural or material details are needed for the commission to make findings related to the building design. The Initial Approval conditions outline the additional information that is necessary for the commission to make such findings.

Generally, and in summary, the Initial Approval Conditions include making refinements to the window sizes and patterns making them more consistent across all elevations, adding windows in various blank wall expanses, simplifying the material palette, and providing a fence detail.

The Commission's subsequent review and continued evaluation of this item is limited to the scope of the Initial Approval conditions. It is the role of the UDC to focus only on whether those conditions have been addressed.

## Summary of Design Considerations

Staff requests the UDC's continued review and evaluation of this proposal for consistency with the conditions of approval as outlined below, and as it relates to the applicable UDD 7 guidelines and requirements. The UDC's role is to ensure that these previously established conditions are met. The UDC cannot waive or change these requirements.

- The applicant shall revise the window sizes and rhythm throughout to be more consistent across all elevations with those on the street-facing elevation but paying particular attention to the windows on the east elevation.

*While the window sizes and locations have been revised to be more consistent across all elevations along the ground floor and middle building component, different window patterns and sizes do continue to exist across the fourth floor on the north and northeast elevations. Staff request the UDC's continued evaluation of this condition.*

*Staff note that there appear to be discrepancies on the fourth-floor plans between the floor plans, elevations, and landscape plans, which do not all show windows and door locations the same.*

- The applicant shall study the possibility of adding openings in the blank wall areas on the east and northeast elevations at the fourth floor.

*As reflected in the elevation drawings, additional windows have not been added to blank wall areas on the north and northeast elevations. It does appear, however, that windows have been removed from the stairwell on the north elevations. Staff request the UDC's continued evaluation of this condition.*

- The material palette shall be revised to simplify the number and/or colors being used, as well as their consistent application across the building composition to achieve a four-sided building. Of particular concern is the design of the east and northeast elevations.

*The Letter of Intent notes that the material palette has been revised to reflect masonry (Endicott – Golden Buff, both smooth face and with a vertical score), Galvalume metal panel, and two wood-tone fiber cement panels (Sandcastle and Roasted Walnut).*

*Staff request the UDC's continued evaluation of the proposed material palette, especially as it relates to using the same level of design and detailing across all four elevations, including as it relates to the vertically scored masonry, which only appears on the backside of the building and the details of its application are unclear (i.e., articulation in change to create shadow line), and the roasted walnut fiber cement panel, which is a new material that is not appear to be carried across all elevations the same.*

*Also related to materials, staff note that a vertical solar panel array has been added to the south elevation as an exterior material cladding the stairwell volume along Lakeside Street. Consideration should be given to the design and materials of this wall, both as it relates to the appearance of solar panels, but also if a solar panel installation is not viable in this location in the future.*

*In addition, staff note that a louver has been added to the north elevation, however the finish details of this louver were not specified, including how it would be finished to ensure that it is integrated into the overall design. Staff recommend that the UDC address the finish treatment of louvers/vents generally in their formal action.*

- The applicant shall submit more detailed information for the proposed fence.

*As noted in the Letter of Intent, the applicant has proposed to protect and preserve the existing wood fence noting that it will be power washed and stained. Staff believe this condition has been met.*

## **Summary of Initial Approval Discussion & Questions**

As a reference, a summary of the Commission's discussion and questions from the February 4, 2025, Initial Approval are provided below.

The Commission noted that the current design was an improvement. The Commission inquired about the metal material and how shiny/reflective it will be. The applicant replied it does patina over time, noting the Lux on Johnson Street had a very similar concern, with the first year having a shinier tint that patinas very quickly. The Secretary noted the material requirements in the Zoning Code; as part of the Zoning analysis additional information will need to be provided to demonstrate that it meets that standard, with material samples submitted to the Zoning Administrator.

The Commission inquired about arched elements and the box corners, noting that the Lakeside view doesn't match the same level of detail as the rest of the building.

The Commission talked about the first-floor wall adjacent to the neighbor, with more detail having been added and looking more defined on the north side, it helps to break that up. The applicant replied they will be installing a new six-foot fence and would be happy to add more details. The UDC noted that more should be done to look at breaking up that wall more and bringing down accent materials more to break up the blank wall more.

The Commission asked about the metal previously having a green tint. This version seems much better and less jarring. The applicant noted that the galvalume gets to be a more muted, deeper gray, with a mottled quality, but does not turn green. The applicant noted that the material was identified based on the project cost.

The Commission talked about context, which should be respected but sometimes a building can be iconic and different. Can that happen with a different application of materials? The metal is the major issue, it is the barn, and the silos. If the form was clad in a material that matched everything around it, it starts to become indicative of what is adjacent to it.

The Commission asked about the fence in the back, and if any other applications were considered to break that up. The applicant replied that there is nice landscaping texture there, with a row of arborvitae to blend into the building and peek over the fence.

The Commission asked for clarification on a public comment regarding Park Street requiring a two-story building form. The applicant replied it is mostly borne from trying to connect the rooftop patios to the kitchen.

The Commission discussed context, noting that this area is very undefined in this area, whether it should be one story or not, whether it belongs with what's going on, it is a difficult spot and the Commission recognizes that. There is not a clear context in this particular block of S Park Street. If anything, it's the Peloton.

The Commission asked about the amount of glazing at the ground floor; the applicant responded those calculations are 40%. The Commission also inquired about the residential and commercial window details noting that usually the commercial windows have less and the residential more details. The applicant noted that they are trying to lean into the differentiation between the two uses.

The Commission asked if the applicant has looked at the vault heights to determine if they could or should be lowered. The applicant replied they did look at it at length, with the height of the vault being right underneath the maximum height limit for the product they are using, as well as for water proofing detailing. The Commission asked the applicant if they have read the public comments the UDC received, particularly regarding landscaping; the applicant noted they had read them.

The Commission inquired about patios being so close to people's windows. Planter boxes are located closer to those windows, with the vegetable garden in the more public space.

The Commission asked about the groove copper weave, noting it looks curved in some areas and flat in others. The applicant replied that in all applications, the 6-inch should all be a flat application.

The Commission asked about the location of the residential main entrance, trying to identify a strong front door. The applicant noted there will be two independent commercial spaces/entrances, and the residential entrance. The front of the property is on Lakeside Street, the primary abutting street is S Park Street; the Zoning Code requires the building entrance be oriented toward the primary abutting street.

The Commission noted concerns on the backside views into the neighbor's yards. Is there something along the roof edge? The roof edge on the fourth floor will be just over the ridge lines of neighbors to not peer into a window at that height. The Commission suggested fenestration or openings to articulate with some engagement from the walls above.

The Commission inquired about the fencing the side yard and whether the areas was completely blocked off. The applicant noted that it was.

The Commission inquired about the groupings of windows on the Lakeside elevation vs those on the east elevation and as the building turns the corner on the east, noting that making the windows align more in terms opening sizes, groupings and rhythm.

The Commission liked the powerful vertical elements on the dome but wondered why that language did not continue on the other façade. The applicant noted that they introduced a second material in a warm black, with v-groove siding in that location, the fourth floor blank wall area is the location of the stair tower (lower elevation), and on the upper elevation, the floor plan didn't call for the fenestration, but it is valid feedback and could be studied. The Commission pointed out the neighbor concerns as something to consider.

The Commission discussed context, respecting it, but not necessarily duplicating it, and the importance of datums. The Commission noted that the overall context here is varied, which makes it unique. Madison could benefit from different massing and shapes, this is a great different kind of roof on a busy street. The metal material is appropriate for the shape. How the materials work together needs work, particularly the strength of vertical lines with the curved lines coming down might be fighting with the copper elements.

The one story portion is limited to one story could be appropriate that matches the one story expressions across the street.

Removing the vaults – it may not be a deal breaker if they go away – its really, really nice to see a new shape – thrilling to see this. Appropriately scaled.

It's not the one material, but it's how the materials are coming together needs some review. The strength of the vertical lines, the overall pallet needs refining. Where the copper is breaking down into the masonry is not doing any favors, it needs further review.

The size and rhythm of the windows would benefit from another look. Question the value and living quality of a 6' x 6' fixed window, they seem large.

The Commission noted the lighting comments in the staff memo, which can be administratively approved.

## Action

On a motion by Klehr, seconded by Mayer, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**, with the following conditions:

- The applicant shall revise the window sizes and rhythm throughout to be more consistent across all elevations with those on the street-facing elevation, but paying particular attention to the windows on the east elevation.
- The applicant shall study the possibility of adding openings in the blank wall areas on the east and northeast elevations at the fourth floor.
- The material palette shall be revised to simplify the number and/or colors being used, as well as their consistent application across the building composition to achieve a four-sided building. Of particular concern is the design of the east and northeast elevations.
- The applicant shall submit more detailed information for the proposed fence.