

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 23, 2011
TITLE: 1719 Monroe Street – Report of the Façade Grant Staff Team, “Eyeopia.” 13 th Ald. Dist. (24580)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: November 23, 2011	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 23, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **ACCEPTED THE REPORT** of the Façade Grant Staff Team for an application located at 1719 Monroe Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Jeremy Cynkar. Water leakage from the parapet wall above has damaged the façade, the joints have been destroyed, in addition to the damage to the window frames, sills and dams. The façade grant would include repairing, replacing and repainting the windows and sills and putting new signage on the building for the tenant below and updating the colors of the entryway. The colors stem off of the modern baroque style of the décor. Barnett pointed out that the black painted window trim faces west and will require continued maintenance and repainting. He also questioned using City funds for this project for what is basically maintenance of the building’s façade, as well as concern for painting the window trim rather than using aluminum cladding; he recommended a PVC trim product instead. O’Kroley concurred with the maintenance comments and agreed the application for a façade grant seemed like maintenance.

A motion was made by Rummel, seconded by Lufler to approve. Discussion dealt with the maintenance issues of painting the window trim on the western wall, the uncertainty of the applicant either using aluminum or repairing the wood, and a range of costs that could be incurred with a PVC project. If the wood is really damaged and needs to be replaced with a different material, an aluminum or PVC product would be acceptable as long as it is very well detailed. Particular attention should be paid to the masonry repairs and see what the numbers really come out to be.

Barnett stated that he sees too many façade grant applications that are for basic repairs. It’s a mechanism to encourage people to improve their properties but the City’s money should not be spent on repairs. This kind of project has me ask why we are spending this money for someone to paint their trim and put up a new sign. He feels very strongly about this and would encourage review of the ordinance. The Secretary stated that while the Urban Design Commission cannot reject a façade grant application, it can recommend rejection to the Common Council.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Lufler, the Urban Design Commission **ACCEPTED THE REPORT**. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-1). Slayton abstained on this item. After the motion to accept the report of the Façade Grant Staff Team, Barnett made a motion to reconsider this item at the next meeting, seconded by Rummel. The motion provided that a notice to reconsider this item be placed on the agenda for the Urban Design Commission's next meeting of December 7, 2011. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

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 4, 4 and 5.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1719 Monroe Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4

General Comments:

- Appears “short-term-trendy.” Heavy on maintenance, light on design.
- Meets standard but borders on repair versus façade improvement. Attractive redo but why should City help fund this?
- Continue to question using City funds for repairs.