

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** February 20, 2013

**TITLE:** 618 South Park Street - Modifications to a Previously Approved Elevation as part of a Façade Improvement Grant in UDD No. 7. 13<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (27983)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** February 20, 2013

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Cliff Goodhart, Henry Lufler, Tom DeChant, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Melissa Huggins and Marsha Rummel.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of February 20, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **APPROVED** a modified version of the original approval. Appearing on behalf of the project was Steve Shulfer, representing Sue Jiang. Shulfer stated that through the course of construction and misunderstandings about what needed to be approved versus what did not need approval, split face block was installed (instead of metal panels originally approved). The building owner would prefer to see the split block remain. Changes from the original approval include the addition of a sign board instead of transom windows (there currently are no tenants), center mullions have been added on both sides of the storefront windows to make it symmetrical, changing the red door to something less prominent (neutral color). The request now is for wood composite; MDK board, not metal panel.

O’Kroley noted that the Commission had previously approved a specific façade appropriate to a building of this period with the façade grant. The Chair asked Percy Brown, the manager of the Façade Grant Staff Team, how they regulate these approvals. Brown replied that the money the City commits is contingent on the applicant following the approvals of the Commission. They send someone out to do a final inspection to verify that before they disperse the money. The funds for this project were suspended following notice of inconsistency with the project as previously approved and Brown will follow the Commission’s lead as to what is decided. The Secretary noted that this project is also within an Urban Design District, which means the Commission acting formally is also binding beyond the monetary issues (façade grant). It was noted that metal panel with some sealing will be much more durable over time; historically appropriate transom glass could be installed with or without the center mullion below.

Comments by the Commission were as follows:

- Concern with panel’s appearance in “popping out.”
- Bothered by sign board versus use of transom lights (windows).
- The MDK board will take a beating at the sidewalk.
- Metal panel with brake metal trim with a masonry base at the sidewalk should be provided.

- Install transom glass as originally approved; historically appropriate with the vertical dividers in the glass storefronts.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **APPROVED** a modified version of the original approval. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-1) with Slayton voting no. The motion provided for the elimination of the proposed sign board with single transom windows above to the right and left of the entry, with metal panel and brake metal trim below vertically divided storefront windows to each side.

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 3, 4, 4 and 5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 618 South Park Street**

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

General Comments:

- Both the process and follow-through.
- Too bad that original plan wasn't followed through.
- If you get an approval for a design, you are obligated to install that.