

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: December 17, 2008
TITLE: 2202-2224 South Park Street – Façade Alterations to Villager Mall Atrium in Urban Design District No. 7. 14 th Ald. Dist. (10903)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: December 17, 2008	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Acting Chair: Ron Luskin, Jay Ferm, Mark Smith, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Dawn Weber, Todd Barnett, and Marsha Rummel.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 17, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the façade alterations to the Villager Mall Atrium. Registering in support were Dale Volkening, Strang, Inc.; Christopher Thiel; and Mark A. Olinger, Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development Director.

Prior to presentation staff noted that the Phase I Atrium improvements currently under consideration was referred at the meeting of September 3, 2008 following final approval of the master plan component for the Villager Mall. Dale Volkening of Strang and Associates then presented revised details of the Phase I Atrium improvements emphasizing the atrium entry façade and adjacent pedestrian plaza. A review of the site plan noted changes to provide for handicap accessibility required with a curvilinear walled ramp; necessitated in order to deal with grade issues. Details of a sign plan for future tenancies including a review of the material and color palate for the Phase I Atrium improvements. Christopher Thiel of Schreiber Anderson proceeded with a review of the finalized site plan noting adjustments to proposed landscaping approved in association with the overall master plan in order to address view shed issues with proposed building signage. Thiel noted that limits on tree-plantings adjacent to the atrium façade were due to conflicts with signage as well as the handicap ramp access issue resulting in the use columnar pear trees as an alternative to larger canopy trees in combination with the use of ground covers in planters. Theil provided a review of the amenities package detailing light fixtures, bike racks, benches and other furniture. Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Need more trees to eliminate the concrete pad effect in view of parking to the building.
- Move the center tree islands in the surface parking lot at Park Street together to align with driveway entry to eliminate conflicts to prevent backing up of vehicles into the driveway.
- Concern with the use of Henry’s Garnet Sweetspire, need more hardy plantings.
- Concern with wall on ramp feature, consider optional materials with a more open appearance.
- Concern with location of accessible stalls concentrated to one-side of the atrium plaza.
- Use of Grandville Globetop light fixture doesn’t tie back to the more modern architecture to the atrium façade.
- The problem with isolated column not at the face of the building, projects out too far, should be inwards toward building or project out two feet more or less in order to get behind.

- Concern with lighting of metal panels on upper façade of main entry being less readable as an entry vs. the more transparent second entry to the right.
- Need more detail on the design of the plaza at the front of the building such as a perspective view as well as more details of the ramp-stair feature. The overall design of the atrium façade does not appear to have an “international feel” as previously noted.
- The atrium graphic does not fit in the overall signage package concept.
- Not enough bike parking, need to do a bike parking demand study.
- The column that splits at main entry should be eliminated: it affects the hierarchy between the main and secondary entry to the atrium and is a physical barrier at the face of the entry.
- Design doesn’t feel international but look at how pieces are put together plus provide for the addition of copper caps at ends.
- Provide additional bike parking.
- Provide lighting to be full cut-off and mesh better with architecture as well as resolve entry/ramp issues.
- In response to the discussion on the light fixture issue, Olinger noted his concern with bringing in yet another type of light fixture into the project where the fixture at proposed as already used within the Villager Mall and other adjacent areas in conjunction with similar modern architecture.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANT INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0-1) with Luskin abstaining. The motion required the address of the above stated concerns with an emphasis on moving the central tree islands together at the driveway entry, reexamine of the design of the ramp to be more open and provide more detailing of the pedestrian plaza. Resolve issues with the hierarchy of the primary and secondary entries including the projecting column as well as beefing up the landscaping and investigating the use of an exterior information kiosk.

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, 5, 5, 5, 6, 6, and 6.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2202-2224 South Park Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	5
	5	5						5
	5	5	5	5/6	5	5/6	6	5
	7	7	6	6	7	6	6	6
	5	6	4	5	6	4	5	5
								6.5
	6	6	5	5		5	5	6

General Comments:

- Seen it before, very average design, an improvement but average, fix main entry post.
- Address column/facade relationship. Study integrating height of concrete ramp with height of base of building. Study ramp as same material as base or show finish of concrete. Show ramp in perspectives.
- How will drop-off work – is there one? Street lighting not in keeping with building architecture and concept of multi-culturalism. Ramp wall should be more transparent.
- Improved, but with inadequate landscaping. Parking is now in the visual front yard. Parking layout and entry off of Park St. creates major safety issue.
- Address columns at front entry. Relocate tree island in interior parking lot to prevent conflicts. Ramp needs more work – make it cool architecturally. More trees where possible, more bike parking.
- Recusal