

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** March 11, 2015

TITLE: 1344 East Washington Avenue – Alteration
to Existing Development in UDD No. 8,
“Pasqual’s Restaurant.” 2nd Ald. Dist.
(37461)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: March 11, 2015

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Melissa Huggins, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant, Lauren Cnare, Cliff Goodhart and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 11, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** for alterations to existing development for “Pasqual’s Restaurant” located at 1344 East Washington Avenue in UDD No. 8. Appearing on behalf of the project were Kirk Biodrowski and Susan Springman, both representing the Mullins Group; and Rigina MacNaughton. This building has been empty for a number of years, and has been retrofitted for Pasqual’s; the most significant issue now being utility equipment being placed on the building, the location of penetrations, and the requirement that they be screened, especially on rooftops. What is an acceptable level of retro and improvements that meet the district requirements? Anything that this Commission requires will have to be coordinated with the Landmarks Commission’s previous approval of the project. The two areas of concern are the rooftop and the west side of the building. Some of the mechanicals will be placed in an area between the building and shed which will be screened by what is already there. They are proposing to place a fence on the side of the building because there is only one other way to vent off of this piece of equipment. There is a bricked-in window behind the stairwell; they have to remove the brick, run their vent through the stairwell and up through the rooftop. Concerns with this are that they are ¾” away from not meeting code with the stairwell, running hot air through a stairwell that is a means of egress seems to be a large enough issue that it overcomes any aesthetic issues. The Secretary further noted that the district requirements state that screening shall be architecturally compatible with the building design, and that disturbing architectural features shall be avoided whenever possible.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- What is the screening on the roof?
 - No physical screening, we suggested we paint it a similar color to the rooftop and Landmarks agreed. It’s a visual screen without actually being a physical screen.
Administratively there is no way I cannot not enforce that, it is a requirement of the district.
- Can we make that finding?

- Yes.
- Isn't there anything you can do that fits the character of the building? Not just something painted that looks out of place.
- Since it's not a grease exhaust, did your engineer rule out a louver in the wall?
 - They did, and I'm not exactly qualified to answer why that was done.
- This is like State Street, we don't put "mushrooms" popping out the fronts of buildings, it's such a detraction from the building's architecture. You have to have something that's more fitting on context.
- What are some of the solutions you've come up with on State Street?
 - They're different designs; they're usually vents or penetrations that are higher up. This is what they requested so it's for the body to decide. Administratively there's nothing I can do on this, just like the rooftop one. The ability not to screen, this is a requirement for me.
- When you say painted the color of the rooftop, you mean the roofing material?
 - Yes, black.
- What's the landscaping plan? You've got an awfully large parking lot.
 - We didn't go over the 10% (not requiring current Zoning Code compliance).

I imagine people will be parking and walking around.

If it's some sort of screen, putting trees in that area.

- I completely understand the dilemma on the interior and that seems like the most palatable solution is to create some kind of landscaping buffer. For me I think the rooftop is fine but that mushroom sticking up there, I think as a business owner I would not want that to be the point of how clients would be experiencing the building as they walk in.
- I agree. It looks like this was some kind of platform at some time. You could continue the platform there, a lot of times they have these shed roofs over it, then you could wrap a little screen wall just in front of it to integrate it with the structure instead of making it look like a shower stall enclosure. Then it would be more integrated with that aesthetic that John was asking about, but also reversible and removal.
 - That's a nice idea except that we need a certain amount of distance from that vent and if we start to screen in front of it too closely...

That could be worked on, this could come out 5 or 6 feet but you'd have to build a platform out there and it could be someplace where people could smoke.

I'm not sure Landmarks would agree with that. They were concerned with us removing any brick from the building, and doing anything to change the exterior of the building, touching it. So the agreement on the vent was that the bricks would be saved.

- Are there more vent options with just a grill on the outside that you've looked at?
 - We're not the designer. Having looked at it ourselves, because of where the kitchen is I'm not sure where else they would put it. It's kind of a necessary evil.
- I understand you've got a vent but I'm not sure you need the mushroom.
 - I'm not sure what the alternative is.
- That's why I'm asking what has been explored.
 - I've asked that question as well. We've done the same kind of thing on State Street. From what I understand there is a scrubber unit that needs to be placed inside somewhere and there're not physical space to put the unit.
- From this photo and vantage point it looks like you're putting in a dumpster enclosure forward of that vent.
 - It's right back in here.
- That's not in yet, that's something you're proposing? If that were redesigned to add a bit more screening that itself might add some more interest. Maybe integrate it with your bike parking, you could create a feature that's freestanding and interesting before this. Distract us before we see this.

- Put a tree in there. Don't put a hedge around the dumpster, it only makes it bigger. But the tree will help.
- I have question as to whether painting that the same color of the brick is helping you at all.
 - Landmarks said we had to paint it.
- You need to know how close that tree would be to the vent and what the temperature coming out of the vent would be. You could use that space between the dumpster and the sidewalk for planting area. I would not use a conifer there, they're not going to do well.
- I'm concerned with all the exterior ductwork running down the face of the building, a mechanical system should be looked at as a comprehensive solution.
- We need more information on other alternatives. Your engineer isn't here to inform us as to why a certain vent is needed or why a certain solution would not work.
- I need to feel more comfortable that this is the only possible solution and then I'd like to see how you'd go about it. I want to feel comfortable that there's no alternative and I don't feel that.
 - (Rigina MacNaughton) I am not an engineer, but the reason they went with the mushroom is because if you do the vent, it takes a scrubber, it's called an "in-line unit," and it has to be inside of the building and there is not enough room with the amount of equipment that's in there already. What you haven't heard is that there are 3 vents going out of that kitchen already, and the other 2 don't present the issue that this mushroom vent does, and this was our last two options to go with that through the stairwell, which raises concerns, or go with the mushroom. The difference being the mushroom versus that flat vent is the in-line unit, and there's not room in there with that equipment. They have worked on this tirelessly, on trying to get the amount of equipment in this historical building. We have tried and tried and tried, this is what we've got it down to based on our equipment.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Huggins, seconded by Cnare, to **GRANT FINAL APPROVAL**, with the finding that painting the rooftop mechanicals is sufficient screening, approve the painted mushroom and to study and put in place some sort of landscaping in order to screen the dumpster area. The motion failed on a vote of (3-4) with Huggins, Cnare and Slayton voting yes; O'Kroley, Goodhart, DeChant and Harrington voting no.

A motion was made by Huggins, seconded by Slayton, to **GRANT FINAL APPROVAL** of the rooftop screening, painting of the rooftop unit. The motion passed on a vote of (6-1) with O'Kroley voting no.

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1) with Cnare voting no. The motion provided for approval of the mushroom with adequate architectural and/or landscaping screening, to be administratively approved, subject to the Secretary conferring with the Commission's landscape architects.

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 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1344 East Washington Avenue

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

General Comments:

- Alternatives and creative suggestions to screening mushroom fan offered.
- Mechanics poorly handled.