

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> June 8, 2011
TITLE: 2300 South Park Street – Demolition Permit/Alteration to Approved Master Plan and Façade Grant for “The Villager Mall” in UDD no. 7. 14 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (21466)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: June 8, 2011	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, Melissa Huggins, Jay Handy and Henry Lufler, Jr.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of June 8, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a demolition permit/alteration to the approved master plan and façade grant for The Villager Mall located at 2300 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were T.C. Lin, Natalie Erdman, representing the CDA of the City of Madison; and Percy Brown, Deputy Executive Director, CDA of the City of Madison. Lin described changes to the south portion of the building including demolishing 100-feet to keep a 50-foot bay, façade treatment and landscaping. They have established another pedestrian connection at the southeast corner, added more greenspace/landscaping, widened the pedestrian sidewalk and flattened out the grate to accommodate future tenants on the south end. To address concerns that the façade was too monolithic, they have incorporated a beacon entry design feature to include a metal panel, extended the functional canopy, added clear story space, and planters to keep this area flexible for future tenants. They also addressed the change of material at the base, raising the concrete foundation upward.

Barnett reiterated a question he had last time the Commission saw the project; why the canopy elements were at different elevations. His sense is that those two pieces should work together. All the identity is visible from only one side. He wondered if there was a way to pull in the blue façade, it seems blank; or scoring a pattern into the EIFS. The site changes are all fine, other than the dimension for the parking stalls for the eastern bay at 18’ and 5’ for the walk; he is concerned about cars decreasing the 5’ to 3’ and suggested changing them to 16’. Rummel stated that having a public entity apply for a façade grant doesn’t seem to be appropriate for its purpose. She does not support that; it’s a program for private property owners to fix up their façades and this takes money out of a limited fund and gives it to the CDA. She would like to separate this approval so the Commission focuses on the two items separately. Wagner stated that even if the Commission doesn’t think this is an appropriate funding source, they are tasked with design issues so they should leave the façade grant questions to the Common Council.

Percy Brown, Executive Deputy Director of the CDA of the City of Madison stated that this has been approved by the Façade Improvement Staff Grant Team based upon the premise that it meets the criteria. You have to be an owner of a commercial establishment and the CDA is the owner of the commercial establishment. The second main objective is that it is intended to assist small private businesses. Although the CDA is not the

business, the primary beneficiary will be the tenant. Façade grants can go to tenants or owners, but the bottom line is who is the beneficiary, which in this case is Yu Wah. He stated this is no different than any of the other 75 façade grants they have brought to the Urban Design Commission over the years. He wrote the façade grant program, and they checked with the City Attorney as to whether they are a City entity; he stated they are separate from the City and the City Attorney sees nothing illegal. Wagner stated that this is an issue for the Common Council and/or the Board of Estimates and suggested they set that aside. Barnett stated that if the City is going to spend \$10,000 for a façade upgrade that the façade, because they are both visible and prominent, should be at the same level of design and detail and right now it seems to not be receiving the attention it is merited.

Smith inquired about clear story windows; Lin stated they are actual lights. Smith asked about the possibility of continuing them longer. He was looking for subtle ways to make the façade better without the expectation that they will have glazing on all the bays. Erdman asked them to be sensitive to the fact that this retailer pays \$10 gross for their space; their rent is increasing in this new space but not to what they would call a market rate. It all relates to how they can offer the space and carry the debt that the City has to take on. Smith asked about extending brick piers; Erdman is trying to keep a 25-year tenant in a new space and carry the debt service. Barnett thought this was a philosophical problem that you come in with a baseline of “this is what’s expected for good design for infill to reestablish this as a destination point,” and the \$10,000 is icing on the cake. Although he likes Smith’s suggestion of running the windows longer, if this can’t be done at the same level, an alternative would be to put the money in other areas. Slayton inquired about the existing parking lot where a future building will be located. Harrington commented on the elimination of plethora of *Clethra alnifolia* “Hummingbird” on the planting plan; he said that plant never does well and welts very quickly. O’Kroley stated that the south façade proportionally does seem resolved and that planters make sense. The east façade she thought was proportionally off, that the columns were not spaced the same. She suggested that the window proportions could be closer to the neighbors with some breathing room before the columns as a way to resolve that problem. She agreed with Barnett in omitting the horizontal steel there and look for another kind of detail to relate to the signage. She would leave this to the discretion of the applicant to study and return to staff. Smith suggested that since the columns on the east façade are new perhaps they could now be at the same elevation as the ones to the south, and bring the cross bar down to line up with the canopy so the signage lines up with the top of the piers. Rummel wanted to clarify with O’Kroley’s about Barnett’s comment to bring the blue color on the other side and if she would see that as part of the motion; she would not because you only enter on one side.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Smith, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-2) with Rummel and Barnett voting no. The motion provided for the following:

- Study continuing line of transoms; one more bay down of south elevation.
- Address landscape comments.
- Add some color and articulation to the south elevation.
- Move the steel down to where it is in general on most of the other sides, a line parallel to the south elevation’s canopy.
- Bring the cross bar down to line up with the canopy.

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 4, 5, 5, 6, 6 and 7/3.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2300 South Park Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	6	5	6	-	-	6	6	6
	5	5	7	-	-	5	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7/3
	4	5	5	-	-	5	5	5
	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5

General Comments:

- Southeast parking is temporary otherwise an awkward vehicular circulation exists.
- Site is fine. Façade grant application requires much work to rise to level of work already done and façade grant expectations.
- Vehicle circulation will be a problem. South façade needs to eat a few more meals.
- CDA not eligible and does not deserve façade grant. Plus no value added shown in design.