

AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: October 29, 2008
TITLE: 2200 South Park Street – Modifications to Previously Approved Plans for The Urban League/Public Library Building in Urban Design District No. 7. 14 th Ald. Dist. (11468)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: October 29, 2008	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Chair; Ron Luskin, Jay Ferm, Bruce Woods, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Todd Barnett and Dawn Weber.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 30, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of modifications to previously approved plans located at 2200 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Mark Olinger, representing the Community Development Authority, and Steve Harms, representing Tri-North Builders. Steve Harms provided a summary of modifications to the previously approved plans for the Urban League of Greater Madison/City of Madison Public Library building, noting the required alterations due to budgetary considerations with the reduction in proposed square footage for one of the building's tenants. Harms noted the following alterations, primarily with the features of the building as previously proposed not involving any changes to the previously approved footprint of the structure as follows:

- Change from previously proposed 3-story to a 2-story building involving reduction of floor space from a previously proposed 10,000 square feet to 4,000 square feet for the "Planned Parenthood" tenancy. This reduction is also a loss of the third floor, where the building was designed structurally for the future capacity of a third floor if expansion is needed.
- The building's façade has been redesigned to add additional glass on various portions of the building that would reveal interior function of both the Urban League and Planned Parenthood tenancies.
- The second story features more glass on the upper corner at the library and incorporates an eyebrow panel above second story buildings.
- Incorporates a metal flat shingle on the stair tower element along South Park Street, including various other minor modifications to the building's façade.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Building more handsome, inviting, better fit for use in neighborhood.
- Question the removal of red awnings on lower elevation along Park Street. If maintained would tie back to red spandrel panels above windows on the upper second story.
- The blank wall at the west elevation is problematic.
- The west elevation facing community space needs more work.

- Consider the use of patterning with brick and/or color on the wing wall, as well as the upper blank wall to provide relief.
- Use vegetation such as vining within these areas to resolve issues with the stark and blank appearance of the north elevation's façade.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion required address of the above stated concerns with enhancements regarding further consideration of the previously proposed red awnings along the lower level of the Park Street elevation and resolving issues with the blank appearance of the building's west elevation.

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 6, 6, 6, 7, 7, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2200 South Park Street

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

General Comments:

- Building architecture is even better.
- Blank walls need to be upgraded with pattern or vines.
- Actually a more handsome version this time. Rear (west) elevation needs more architecture interest, however.