

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: May 16, 2012

TITLE: 801 South Park Street – New PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development (Erin Square) in UDD No. 7. 13th Ald. Dist. (16320)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 16, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton*, Todd Barnett, Melissa Huggins, Tom DeChant and John Harrington.

*Slayton recused himself on this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 16, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 801 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was John Bieno. Appearing neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak were Greg Kopish, representing the Monona Bay Neighborhood Association; and John Lombardo. Bieno presented revised plans which maintain the square footage of the building and keeps everything on their property. Compromises were made along the southern edge with the fence remaining at the request of the neighborhood, with 7.5-feet of frontage. The Secretary stated that the Planning Division had concerns about using the alleyway and requested that the architecture be more consistent with the previous approval for the 3-story version of the building, rather than the redesigned proposal presented last time.

John Lombardo spoke positively about the alleyway. His building is 707 South Park Street with a second floor residential tenant. He inquired about the possibility of putting a sound barrier similar as will be done for the surrounding homes. The Chair stated that this is an issue for the Plan Commission.

Greg Kopish spoke, pleased with the escape lane. He also asked if the sound barrier could be extended and presented a list of conditions the neighborhood has sent to the board; that goes to the Plan Commission as part of their review of the project.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The balconies directly above the awnings seem a bit uncomfortable and repetitive.
 - We looked at taking out the awnings that were underneath them but that didn’t feel comfortable. We prefer to leave the awnings going across there. There’s no rhythm if we remove some of them.

Is there no space between the two? Does it abut directly to the balcony?

- Not a noticeable amount.

It feels awkward to me.

- They will be used for signage. That will come back.

- The piece that takes the curb, that should be a major gesture. It's not a very substantial volume that is treated differently; the material and scale look the same.
- I'm sad that you've gone back, it was a much more exciting project before.
- The corner just doesn't seem to do enough. The shed roof concerns me the most, it looks like a little bit "cartoonish;" shape should be more profound and substantial. Water is going to dribble down it, you're going to have to have a gutter. It seems like that should be something more profound on the building. It just doesn't work.
- Drop sill on second floor corner element to make more vertical.
- I'm concerned about the stacked brick underneath the windows. I think it detracts from the simplicity.
- Window size and proportion along Park Street needs more consistency.
- The trees in the back, it would be nice to push them closer to the street so it ends up in the little triangle area. It'll help give it more wrapping to the building and help from the alley to tie in and make a stronger edge.
- Push canopy trees more out to the street.
- Can you do something with your rooftop mechanical screening to strengthen the piece that's skewed?
 - Yes, we can even tie it together at the corner with a similar piece that is going on elsewhere.
- If the awnings are crashing into this piece that's now holding the curb, I would run those straight as opposed to turning them. Are we walking people to that end door or are we telling them to zig zag in and out. I think that end piece needs to be stronger and that will resolve that line. It hasn't hit the sweet spot yet.
- I'm glad they found a way to put the use on this site (drive-up).
- Look at creating a pattern with the brick that will make it more pronounced.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0-1) with Slayton recusing himself. The motion provided initial approval for the site, massing and materials with address of the above stated concerns and the following:

- Site, massing, materials, with the architectural features and landscaping discussed to return.
- Try to find another way to address the integration of the balconies with the awnings.
- Window pattern and sizes on the base story.
- Eliminate the shed roof at the entry.
- Reset the stack bond element.
- Reexamine materials and details for the balconies.

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, 6, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 801 South Park Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	8	4	5	-	-	-	6	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	5	6	-	-	6	7	6

General Comments:

- Thanks for solving circulation issues on site.
- Much improved site design. Architectural details need improvement. Main entrance very weak.
- Site fine, architectural details not there.