

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: April 4, 2012

TITLE: 6021 University Avenue – Exterior
Remodeling in UDD No. 6. 19th Ald. Dist.
(25681)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: April 4, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Richard Slayton*, Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, and Henry Lufler.

*Slayton recused himself from this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 4, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of exterior remodeling in UDD No. 6 located at 6021 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Mary Beth Growney Selene, representing Ryan Signs, Inc.; Ald. Mark Clear, District 19; Carey Cress Fose and Chris Griffiths, both representing Cress Funeral Home. The private drive, as part of the City’s University Avenue construction, is becoming a 3-way with one ingress and two egresses, on the westerly side of Cress Funeral Home. The existing entrance exit is remaining. Four landscaping islands are being added to the parking lot, as well as removal the main drive across the front to pick up greenspace. They plan to repave the entire lot and install new lighting. The major additions to the structure include new roof areas, a tower element in the front facing University Avenue, and removal of the back canvas canopy with replacement of a more permanent fixture. All the existing lighting on the site is going to be removed and replaced; bollards for pedestrians along the sidewalk up to the main entrance will be added, as well as new fixtures in the center of the parking lot and the perimeter. They have provided an HVAC screening device. Proposed elevations show a mechanical tower that is backlit above at the clearstory. The canopy on the south faces the drop-off area. An existing carport will become enclosed for the hearse. The development of a courtyard from the current patio will include stone columns, fencing, benches and an outdoor fireplace. Materials will be a combination of cultured stone, painted brick, a weathered wood roof, a little EIFS high on the tower and replacement of all fascias and soffits in medium bronze with glazing in bronze. Some wood clad units will be replacing existing units in the fenestration in terra tone also. The landscaping plan shows a buffer in front of the property line, landscaped tree islands, and screening against the abutting cul-de-sac. Understory flowering trees have been incorporated along the perimeter to break up the shrub masses. Growney Selene presented the new signage package for relocating the existing monument sign, currently located at the east end of the project and will be locate up at the new drive on the west side of the project. The other portion of signage is for four building signs, which will pick up on the bronze palette from the building’s renovation. The University Avenue elevation is no longer accessible for an entrance, with the two signs on the tower for visibility from the street for identification only (north and west

sides). The rear sign will be to designate the main entrance of the building. Since that hasn't been a major entrance to the building until this point it's very important to have that signage there. The fourth sign is located on the east elevation mounted on the stone of the outside fireplace at eye level. The backlighting of the signage will be white LED. Questions and comments included the following:

- Is this an increase in signage?
 - The four building signs are new, all of them meet the guidelines and regulations of the Urban Design District.
- The signage near the main entry, is it really near the main entry or more on the side of the building?
 - It's really not by the entrance, it's by this corner so when you drive in you can see it on the corner here.

I don't know that it's necessary, but if it complies that's fine.

- In terms of the lighting plan, I would like to see the illumination but not the source for; provide indirect lighting for building without seeing the fixture, it's your option.
- Painting the brick can really cause issues with moisture in terms of maintenance and longevity.
 - As we were looking at the brick color, we were going to wash it but Sherman Williams had a recommendation of painting the brick to get a bit of a lighter palette and contrast with the vegetation. We haven't yet determined the species of paint and primer we'll use.
 - Fose spoke to the Commission about the 8 other facilities in Dane County; they have painted some of them before, we have gone from brick to paint and have had no problem. We occasionally have to touch up a piece we bump but we've had no peeling or any other issues. You definitely have to prepare the surface and temperature is key.
- I particularly like that you are eliminating the parking in front.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by O'Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (3-0-1) with Slayton recusing himself. The motion provided for the following:

- The motion noted the project's consistency with the provisions of UDD No. 6 for landscaping, lighting and signage.
- Provide more context on the building, as well as examples of the brick and painting issues for further discussion.

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 is 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 6021 University Avenue

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

General Comments:

- Attractive building and addition.