

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: September 16, 2009
TITLE: 515 South Park Street – Building Addition, “La Hacienda” in Urban Design District No. 7. 13 th Ald. Dist. (15800)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: September 16, 2009	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn Weber, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Ron Luskin, Richard Wagner and Jay Ferm.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 16, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a building addition located at 515 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were David Herrera and Jesse Ramirez. Appearing neither in support nor opposition were Sue Hoffenberg and Steve Hoffenberg. Ramirez, representing “La Hacienda” restaurant summarized revisions to the proposed plan for an addition to the existing restaurant in response to the Commission’s previous comments. The elevations now features design elements consistent with façade “Option C” as previously presented which provide for the removal of skylights on the roof behind the parapet, the utilization of a brick arch feature with direct support overlying the arch window elements, along with the intent to provide for operable windows where the window type has not yet been decided. On-site filtration of rainwater will be provided with the use of a proposed rain garden area to the south of the building adjacent to the property’s southerly lot line. If the area cannot be developed as a rain garden, as an alternative rain barrels will be utilized with reuse of its contents for on-site watering and irrigation. Ramirez also noted the location of the existing wall sign above the redesigned entry. Following the presentation staff noted that the Commission must make a finding that the provisions for Urban Design District No. 7 have been satisfied with the addition as proposed where the Commission can waive a 2-story requirement based on a demonstration that “the siting or layout of the existing building would pose hardships for its functional relationship with the new addition.”

Discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- The one-story addition is appropriate to the scale of the one-story building which substantiates the Commission’s ability to waive the two-story requirement.
- Issues on the north elevation arch and spring point that is too tight need to be looked at. Consider narrowing arch as done on the west elevation.
- Project much improved. On the north center door provide a single arch with side lights to each side, in addition reflect banding and keystones as on the existing building and use different material and/or concrete cap at base. In addition, think about snow/salt issues.
- Disappointed with lack of consideration for the development of a mezzanine as an alternative to not providing for a 2-story structure. The option would provide for a greater economic return for the

applicant with more usable interior space, as well as appeal to a structure that would be closer to the 2-story height requirement.

- Space between properties to be utilized for rain garden may be too small and may require the addition to be stepped in order to provide for additional area for development of a rain garden. In an urban context, rain garden in the area may be inappropriate.
- Disappointed about not producing a mezzanine feature that would benefit economically and act as a feature.
- Rain garden not appropriate, too small, too urban; rain barrel or reservoir system more appropriate or alternate planting system.
- Concern with misdirection to the applicant provided with suggestion of the mezzanine option based on instructions with provisions review of the project.
- Break up blank architecture on west elevation with window feature, more bike parking or at least define a space that provides for existing bike parking to provide for 12 nice clean bike parking spots.

Sue Hoffenberg spoke in support of the project noting her appreciation for the design and consideration of adjoining neighbors.

ACTION:

On a motion by Weber, seconded by Luskin, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion provided for details of the existing building's architecture to be incorporated into the addition as appropriate, adjustments of the north elevation arch and spring point, and an examination of stormwater management on the site per the comments to be reviewed and approved by staff.

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 are 5, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6 and 6.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 515 South Park Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	6	-	-	-	6	6	6
	-	7	-	-	-	-	5	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	6	-	-	-	-	6	6
	-	6	-	-	-	-	7	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.5

General Comments:

- Utilize as many operable windows as possible, span the entire width of the arched opening so entire width opens together.
- Disappointed that mezzanine not explored; details to resolve on façade.
- Nice expansion.
- Overall, nice remodel; north façade arches need restoration.