



**Agenda Item #:** 6

**Project Title:** 999 S Park Street - New Mixed-Use Building in Urban Design District (UDD) 7. (District 13)

**Legistar File ID #:** 90917

**Members Present:** Shane Bernau\*, Chair; David McLean, Davy Mayer, Anina Mbilinyi, Jessica Klehr, Rafeeq Asad

**Prepared By:** Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

\*Bernau recused on this item. McLean acted as Chair.

## Summary

At its meeting of February 4, 2026, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a new mixed-use building located at 999 S Park Street in Urban Design District (UDD) 7. Registered and speaking in support were Michael Carlson, and Jake DeHaven. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Joe Voell, Donovan Brendler, and Craig Koltes. Registered in support but not wishing to speak was Nicholas Davies. Registered neither in support nor opposition, available to answer questions was Terrence Wall. Registered and speaking neither in support nor opposition was Ingrid Dilley. Registered and speaking in opposition were Helen Kitchel, Steven Davis, and Carrie Rothburd. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak were Laura Zirngible, Matthew Lohmann, Sarah Atis, Daniel Thurs, Judith Robinson, Janelle Munns, and Jean Kuehn.

### Summary of Commission Discussion and Questions:

The Commission noted that the current design was an improvement. The Commission inquired about the metal material and how shiny/reflective it will be. The applicant replied it does patina over time, noting the Lux on Johnson Street had a very similar concern, with the first year having a shinier tint that patinas very quickly. The Secretary noted the material requirements in the Zoning Code; as part of the Zoning analysis additional information will need to be provided to demonstrate that it meets that standard, with material samples submitted to the Zoning Administrator.

The Commission inquired about arched elements and the box corners, noting that the Lakeside view doesn't match the same level of detail as the rest of the building.

The Commission talked about the first-floor wall adjacent to the neighbor, with more detail having been added and looking more defined on the north side, it helps to break that up. The applicant replied they will be installing a new six-foot fence and would be happy to add more details. The UDC noted that more should be done to look at breaking up that wall more and bringing down accent materials more to break up the blank wall more.

The Commission asked about the metal previously having a green tint. This version seems much better and less jarring. The applicant noted that the galvalume gets to be a muter, deeper gray, with a mottled quality, but does not turn green. The applicant noted that the material was identified based on the project cost.

The Commission talked about context, which should be respected but sometimes a building can be iconic and different. Can that happen with a different application of materials? The metal is the major issue, it is the barn, and the silos. If the form was clad in a material that matched everything around it, it starts to become indicative of what is adjacent to it.

The Commission asked about the fence in the back, and if any other applications were considered to break that up. The applicant replied that there is nice landscaping texture there, with a row of arborvitae to blend into the building and peek over the fence.

The Commission asked for clarification on a public comment regarding Park Street requiring a two-story building form. The applicant replied it is mostly borne from trying to connect the rooftop patios to the kitchen.

The Commission discussed context, noting that this area is very undefined in this area, whether it should be one story or not, whether it belongs with what's going on, it is a difficult spot and the Commission recognizes that. There is not a clear context in this particular block of S Park Street. If anything, it's the Peloton.

The Commission asked about the amount of glazing at the ground floor; the applicant responded those calculations are 40%. The Commission also inquired about the residential and commercial window details noting that usually the commercial windows have less and the residential more details. The applicant noted that they are trying to lean into the differentiation between the two uses.

The Commission asked if the applicant has looked at the vault heights to determine if they could or should be lowered. The applicant replied they did look at it at length, with the height of the vault being right underneath the maximum height limit for the product they are using, as well as for water proofing detailing. The Commission asked the applicant if they have read the public comments the UDC received, particularly regarding landscaping; the applicant noted they had read them.

The Commission inquired about patios being so close to people's windows. Planter boxes are located closer to those windows, with the vegetable garden in the more public space.

The Commission asked about the groove copper weave, noting it looks curved in some areas and flat in others. The applicant replied that in all applications, the 6-inch should all be a flat application.

The Commission asked about the location of the residential main entrance, trying to identify a strong front door. The applicant noted there will be two independent commercial spaces/entrances, and the residential entrance. The front of the property is on Lakeside Street, the primary abutting street is S Park Street; the Zoning Code requires the building entrance be oriented toward the primary abutting street.

The Commission noted concerns on the backside views into the neighbor's yards. Is there something along the roof edge? The roof edge on the fourth floor will be just over the ridge lines of neighbors to not peer into a window at that height. The Commission suggested fenestration or openings to articulate with some engagement from the walls above.

The Commission inquired about the fencing the side yard and whether the areas was completely blocked off. The applicant noted that it was.

The Commission inquired about the groupings of windows on the Lakeside elevation vs those on the east elevation and as the building turns the corner on the east, noting that making the windows align more in terms opening sizes, groupings and rhythm.

The Commission liked the powerful vertical elements on the dome but wondered why that language did not continue on the other façade. The applicant noted that they introduced a second material in a warm black, with v-groove siding in that location, the fourth floor blank wall area is the location of the stair tower (lower elevation), and on the upper elevation, the floor plan didn't call for the fenestration, but it is valid feedback and could be studied. The Commission pointed out the neighbor concerns as something to consider.

The Commission discussed context, respecting it, but not necessarily duplicating it, and the importance of datums. The Commission noted that the overall context here is varied, which makes it unique. Madison could benefit from different massing and shapes, this is a great different kind of roof on a busy street. The metal material is appropriate for the shape. How the materials work together needs work, particularly the strength of vertical lines with the curved lines coming down might be fighting with the copper elements.

The one story portion is limited to one story could be appropriate that matches the one story expressions across the street.

Removing the vaults – it may not be a deal breaker if they go away – its really, really nice to see a new shape – thrilling to see this. Appropriately scaled.

It's not the one material, but it's how the materials are coming together needs some review. The strength of the vertical lines, the overall pallet needs refining. Where the copper is breaking down into the masonry is not doing any favors, it needs further review.

The size and rhythm of the windows would benefit from another look. Question the value and living quality of a 6' x 6' fixed window, they seem large.

The Commission noted the lighting comments in the staff memo, which can be administratively approved.

## Action

On a motion by Klehr, seconded by Mayer, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**, with the following conditions:

- The applicant shall revise the window sizes and rhythm throughout to be more consistent across all elevations with those on the street-facing elevation, but paying particular attention to the windows on the east elevation.
- The applicant shall study the possibility of adding openings in the blank wall areas on the east and northeast elevations at the fourth floor.
- The material palette shall be revised to simplify the number and/or colors being used, as well as their consistent application across the building composition to achieve a four-sided building. Of particular concern is the design of the east and northeast elevations.
- The applicant shall submit more detailed information for the proposed the fence.

The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (4-0).