

## AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> November 1, 2006	
TITLE: 454 West Johnson Street – PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development. 4 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (04639)	<b>REFERRED:</b>	
	<b>REREFERRED:</b>	
	<b>REPORTED BACK:</b>	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b>	<b>POF:</b>
DATED: November 1, 2006	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>	

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Lou Host-Jablonski, Michael Barrett, Todd Barnett, Robert March, Cathleen Feland, Bruce Woods and Ald. Noel Radomski.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of November 1, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(GDP-SIP) for a twelve-story, 197-unit with first floor retail/commercial and a health club on the second floor located at 454 West Johnson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Gary Brink, architect. Staff noted to the Commission that the project was located in Downtown Design Zone 2 which allows for a 10-story maximum plus a 2-story bonus under a proposed Planned Unit Development District zoning if found consistent with the “Exterior and Interior Design Criteria for Planned Unit Development Districts in Downtown Design Zones” as required by provisions of the Zoning Code. Staff noted to the Commission that the plans as originally submitted by the applicant were not forwarded within the packet due to its inconsistencies with these above provisions where the applicant was allowed to proceed with an informational presentation on the development proposal based on an anticipated presentation of consistent plans. Brink provided a detailed overview on the proposed development consistent with the provisions, as well as those that were not. Details of both a downsized projecting canopy at the front of the building (portico) along its West Johnson Street frontage as well as an alternative full sized projecting canopy (porte cochere) that would provide protective measures for a drop-off and parking along that Johnson Street frontage; an incursion into a required setback, in addition to consideration of two additional stories above ten, in addition to a rooftop’s common area featuring a “columned architectural element.” Brink noted that the plans as presented did provide for the required stepbacks at the 7<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> floor levels of the proposed structure. Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Like the project but the standards need flexibility in order to consider.
- Won’t see most features of the building (relevant to) the Johnson Street elevation; will see southerly corner, which is less interesting, less detailed although the building as a whole has nice proportions, nice layering and is handsome.
- Some concern with the use of EIFS at the top stories; doesn’t complement the rich palette of materials on the lower stories.
- The main view of the building is coming down West Johnson Street at the building’s south corner which is the most visible. The building is more plain and ordinary from this view.

- Disparity between the flat arches and curved arches on the lower two levels on the building's north and west elevations not fit.
- The building looks like a grand hotel, bring some articulation over from the front to the south elevation and corner.
- Relevant to the loose architectural elements, the EIFS is not appropriate; important to handle with more of a quality material.
- Not comfortable with the amount of tear-downs required with this project.
- The criteria for Planned Unit Developments in Downtown Design Zones are quite clear on the required massing, external building design, transitional elements and appropriate scale required but not addressed with this project.
- There is no street interface with building at the corner; no civic presence.
- The lower level storefronts nothing but plate glass; no classic storefront face or indentations.
- Top stories turning white; too transparent should be treated like the rest of the building, needs color.
- Building doesn't meet the criteria, a throwback not in character with the area.
- Arches don't relate, don't balance at the lower level.
- Lower base element of the building (2-stories) should be unified in material and composition.
- The rooftop element is too much, attracts too much attention.
- The lower arches on the first floor level look too flat for width of the openings.
- Want to see more details from West Johnson Street as to how the building fits with what exists across the street as well as across Bassett Street; need to provide cross-sections on how it all fits together, including more detailed contextual information.
- Issue with the balcony corner treatment fitting the style of the building may need to be contained.
- The façade treatment along Johnson Street should wrap around further.
- The criteria to grant the extra two stories as proposed requires more relevant address with the design of the building.
- The additional two stories requested as a bonus within the Downtown Design Zone is yet another reason to reconsider the materials.

### **ACTION:**

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

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, 5, 6, 6 and 7.5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 454 West Johnson Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	6	3	-	-	-	6	3	4
	6	8	-	-	-	7	9	7.5
	5	6	-	-	-	6	6	6
	6	6	-	-	-	-	6	6
	4	4	4	5	-	6	5	4

General Comments:

- Good site concepts and development of internal uses. Architecture, however, needs work. If it’s going to “recall” historic style, it needs to be done right. It’s not there yet, however. Corner needs more emphasis.
- This design does not meet the criteria for “extraordinary” to warrant the 2-story bonus.
- Handsome building. Hope you can get the ordinance changed.
- Need to see further development of project.
- Project needs a lot of work for extra two floors. Wedding cake top is iffy.
- Excellent introduction of business/retail component. Location of “porte” takes away too much of site at street edge. Handsome building. Think about corner as viewed from west. Style may be over the top.
- I question the necessity of the continuing teardown of our classic Victorians. Even if the demolition can be justified, this is entirely out of scale to what is called for in the Downtown Design Zone criteria: “Appropriate transitions.” This scale will doom the neighborhoods to the southeast.