

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: September 2, 2020

TITLE: 1224 S. Park Street – New Mixed-Use Building in UDD No. 7. 13th Ald. Dist. (61857)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: September 2, 2020

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Shane Bernau, Tom DeChant, Jessica Klehr, Syed Abbas, Christian Harper and Russell Knudson.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 2, 2020, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a new mixed-use building located at 1224 S. Park Street in UDD No. 7. Registered and speaking in support was Kevin Burow, representing Knothe & Bruce Architects, LLC. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Joe Krupp. Registered in support but not wishing to speak was Tyler Krupp. Burow presented this redevelopment to remove a one-story commercial building and replace it with a 5-story mixed-use building with vehicular parking accessed from two points. Enclosed and sheltered parking is provided. Commercial will front along S. Park Street with the main building lobby entrance. This is a C-shaped building to create a plaza deck on top of the enclosed parking deck, and the building does step back at the upper stories per UDD No. 7 standards. They are working with the City on relocating the sidewalk further back onto the property to accommodate an 8-foot wide terrace along S. Park Street, setting the building 10-feet back from the property line for an over 8-foot landscape buffer. A 20 foot rear yard will be landscaped and dedicated for a future bike path off High Street. The architecture revolves around the upper story stepback with the fourth floor level shown stepped back 15-feet and masonry detailing around the whole building. Moving the stepback to above the 4th floor is offered as an alternative which gives a stronger base and gains 3 additional units.

The Commission discussed the following:

- I like the four-story version better from an architectural point of view, feels more substantial in terms of base, middle, top. My only caveat is why wouldn't you take the brick up on the sides of the building to match the four story height on the front?
- Ald. Evers: There was an approval for a 2-story office building for medical or dental at this site, which neighbors were reluctant to give their blessing to. I am in favor of this project with this scale and this density, and it addresses our challenges about needing more housing. I like the four story going up to five. I compliment the developer on their willingness to have those challenging conversations.
- The glazed square tile detail on the brick at the top of the transom height, the way it's shown here has a bit of a post-modern look to me, I would prefer to see brick detailing using the brick in a textural way

rather than inserting that glazed block. Prefer the four-story with the fifth recessed. Could be the darker color so it completely recesses.

- Both options are pretty attractive, this is a nice infill project. Given the needs for density and the context and location of this project, I would also vote for the four-stories on Park Street. Some of the roof deck spaces look a little bland and could use some more life other than pedestal planters or hardscape space.
- This has nice restraint to it, not too many materials to compete with the design. The proportions are really nice. As for the canyon effect, it's anything but along Park Street here. I like moving the buildings back for larger pedestrian experiences. Nice job.
- I agree, particularly that north elevation has a really nice rhythm to it and your vertical lines of masonry going all the way through is really nice on every facade, except for the colored north elevation. Why are the openings on the fifth floor different than below?
 - The window configuration is varied because the units are shallower in depth because of the stepback, creating its own character for balance.
- I think it's not very perceivable in real life given the stepback.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.