

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: April 3, 2013

TITLE: 502 South Park Street – PUD, New Construction (The Ideal) in UDD No. 7, Mixed-Use Development, Review Window Alternative. 13th Ald. Dist. (25508)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary; Jay Wendt, Urban Design Planner

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: April 3, 2013

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 3, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of Commission recommended window alternatives for a previously reviewed and approved mixed-use development located at 502 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Craig Enzenroth, Robin Pharo and Joe Gallina, all representing Gallina Companies; and Kevin Gilbertson. Enzenroth stated that the first floor commercial space still will utilize the aluminum storefront windows. The upper residential levels are proposed for a vinyl window with an anodized colored finish. The colors match very well with the building and the energy performance is much better. They cannot meet the design criteria with the currently designed windows on the project. The emphasis is on sustainability and the performance of the windows. The daylight areas that the windows will allow is identical. They presented a 16-foot mock-up wall with vinyl windows at the top level and aluminum windows on the bottom level; the plywood is painted the same color to match the rust color on the panel. O’Kroley noted that the condition of the motion of September 19, 2012 was that the aluminum storefront windows with casement operation and applied muttons require redesign to achieve the industrial character and feel; the design team noted they were all aluminum windows during their presentation. Enzenroth stated that all of the residential windows are casement windows.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- You’re going for Wisconsin Green Built, you’re not going for LEED? How far off in terms of the points are the windows?
 - The problem with the window efficiency is that we have to get to a better than code rating. Green Built requires you to meet a minimum energy efficient standard, which doesn’t sound like a lot on paper but you have to be 3% greater than the code. Even to get 3% greater we have to increase insulation in the attic, increase insulation in the walls significantly. Really the only way at this point from assemblies that are built is we have to reduce the window size in the building

to get that efficiency, because the aluminum has such a poor rating. We can't get domestically sourced aluminum windows that meet the energy star rating.

- You're ascribing this problem to the approval process.
 - This met the fifth story requirement, it had to have extraordinary sustainability or significant architectural significance. It was this body, to my understanding.
 - I was there at the meeting, I'm Joe Gallina, and all the neighbors showed up with a number of them asking if we were going to be energy efficient, and the Commission strongly encouraged us to make the building energy efficient.

I don't know that that means we're setting aside the other design requirements.

I was here. I left the meeting that we had to do this.

Staff will come back with the record.

- There are other ways to improve the performance, the type of glazing, coating, aluminum windows have recycled content. There are a variety of approaches.
 - The coating on the aluminum version is the highest rated glass.
- I always felt the height is appropriate. I know you worked very hard with this Commission but in my mind the fifth story was a condition of the quality of the architecture. I understand there were very strong feelings from the neighborhood and it would be good to get the record. I don't think it would be in our purview, this body, to make a motion to approve conditioned on sustainability. We would say the quality of the architecture.
 - I don't think it was a condition of approval.

That's what we need to be clear on.

It was not a written condition of approval.

Staff noted that they went through several scenarios with Steve Kieckhafer, architect on what could be and what couldn't work, with staff saying this has to meet the conditions as stated. Kieckhafer said he would but when he came down he came with the old drawings without the appropriate notes and staff had him hand-write those notes on there. The version that is on the official record has no hand written notes.

- We came down and substituted all the sheets with Tim Parks.

Staff noted Tim Parks would have nothing to do with the conditions of the Urban Design Commission. The design consideration is because of the attempt to replicate that sense of an industrial building, which the vinyl windows don't do. Goodhart stated that the industrial steel sash windows typically have a thinner profile in the sash, which these vinyl windows appear to. They also mimic a putty line that you might see in a steel industrial window. Of more concern is the long-term color consistency of vinyl; what's that going to look like over time because it looks like it's a metallic finish. Pharo responded that these are integrated colors so they exclude the gray. O'Kroley noted that the submitted documentation shows an example of a wood window with aluminum cladding. She further mentioned that what was presented here does not meet the condition of the previous approval and that the applied mutttons that appear to be on the first floor windows are not successful.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the modified proposal. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion provided for the following:

- Wood aluminum clad windows for the residential parts of the building.
- The design of how that works for the storefronts needs to be resubmitted to deal with the question of the verticals and horizontals to achieve unity in that concept, to be submitted to staff.
- Clarify whether the cladding is available in clear anodized.

- The design team should study if awning operation and casement would achieve a more unified appearance on the elevation. Look at 1, 2 and 3 as a family of windows and how this entire façade is going to be activated. Window type 3 specifically feels like a more suburban application rather than an urban, industrial application.
- All windows should be awning type and the façade shall present a unified appearance.

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 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 502 South Park Street

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

General Comments:

- While vinyl’s long-term color consistency compared to aluminum is questionable, the sash profile is more delicate. Aluminum clad over wood is preferred.
- Industrial character of windows needs to be maintained.