

## AGENDA # 12

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> December 6, 2006
TITLE: 110 South Henry Street – Existing PUD-SIP, Façade Renovation, Meriter. 4 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (05084)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>POF:</b></span>
DATED: December 6, 2006	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Lou Host-Jablonski, Lisa Geer, Michael Barrett, Todd Barnett, Ald. Noel Radomski, Bruce Woods and Robert March.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of December 6, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a façade renovation for Meriter located at 110 South Henry Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Bruce Simonson, architect and Rosemary Lee. The project involves the interior and exterior renovation of the top three floors of an existing 15-story residential structure operated by Meriter Retirement Services, the Meriter Heights Building. The typical floor plan contains 16-units approximately 500 square feet in size, which will be gutted and replaced with six upsize units per floor (18-units replacing 48-units). The exterior alterations of the building involve the addition of balconies off of individual units, a reskinning of the upper elevation with aluminum panels, including the replacement of windows and spandrel glass panels. In addition, the main entry to the building off of the Henry Street elevation has been redesigned to incorporate piers that support a protective canopy to provide for an enhanced entry and vestibule, combined with a reconfigured exterior seating area. A new mechanical system for the entire building is proposed, including a rooftop fluid cooler, along with a screened wall below the Capitol View Preservation Limits. Speaking in support of the project was Rosemary Lee, providing information relevant to support by the Capitol Neighborhoods, as well as Ald. Verveer. Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Like the overall concept, like handling of topping off of the building.
- Elevation and rendering don't agree with plan in terms of proposed windows. Consider introducing windows on lower levels of the short end elevation.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by Barnett, initial approval was granted of the upper façade treatment with the entry issue to return only for further consideration, on a vote of (7-1) with Ald. Radomski voting no. An earlier motion by March, seconded by Ald. Radomski for final approval failed on a tie vote of (4-4) with Woods, Barnett, Host-Jablonski and Wagner voting no. A previous motion by Barnett, seconded by March for final approval was withdrawn. Subsequent to consideration of this item prior to adjournment, a motion to reconsider initial approval by Host-Jablonski, seconded by Barnett passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0).

Followed by a motion by March, seconded by Host-Jablonski for final approval of the upper façade treatment with the entry treatment to return for separate approval on a vote of (6-2), with Wagner and Barnett voting no.

On a motion by March, seconded by Host-Jablonski, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0-1) with Ald. Radomski voting no.

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, 7, 7, 7, 7, 8, 8 and 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 110 South Henry Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	-	7	-	-	-	-	7	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	-	6	-	-	-	-	8	7
	-	5	-	-	-	-	5	5
	-	7	-	-	-	7	8	7
	7	7	-	7	-	7	8	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8

General Comments:

- Really very good, fresh, improvement to a dated building. Kudos!
- Change at level 12 a bit abrupt, but high enough up to be less noticeable.
- Balconies too heavy visually. Craftsman style entry out of character with more modern top.
- Very much improved visual appearance, adds real character to building.
- Upper stories look great.
- Windows at short ends needed; plan/elevation don't agree re: top floor windows; like concept.