



Agenda Item #: 2

Project Title: 1814-1818 Parkside Drive - Imagination Center at Reindahl Park, City of Madison Public Library in Urban Design District (UDD) 5. (District 12)

Legistar File ID #: 79954

Members Present: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Marsha Rummel, Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Rafeeq Asad*, Christian Harper, and Wendy von Below

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

*Asad was recused on this item

Summary

At its meeting of March 13, 2024, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the Imagination Center at Reindahl Park located at 1814-1818 Parkside Drive, in Urban Design District (UDD) 5. Registered and speaking in support were Christopher Sina, and Garrett Tomesh. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Jennifer Camp, Krissy Wick, CJ Ryan, and Brent Pauba.

The Commission had the following questions for staff and the development team:

- How many parking stalls are there?
 - Near the same quantity as exists, some were removed for updates and the circle drop-off.
- I wanted to raise the question about what is enough parking at a park.
- We need to review and make findings related to the proposed material palette. Can you give more detail?
 - The front façade (parking side) is milano terra in a brown horizontal panel, signage area is tempered gray panel, dark green canopy in same color as pops of color within the gradient, along with other matching greens, blues and purple. The gray at the entrances is Trespa panel matched to the storefront system, and denoting the park elevation is an alucobond panel. The park side is dominated with more natural colors.

The Commission discussed the following:

- The staff report talks about compatibility with context, no large unbroken façades, same level of design treatment on all sides, the landscape plan was well thought out and presented, additional lighting will need to come back.
- We just had an in-depth conversation about this planting strategy on a building and were not very optimistic about it. Can Christian and Shane weigh in on it?
- This will be a successful type of wall installation here, as opposed to the shelter project. These are heartier plants that will be planted in the ground, they're much more restrained in growth and should stay on those trellises in a much more maintainable way. These are climbing Hydrangeas, hearty, nicely flowering vine and will do great in this location. Looks like a nice set up they have for support and training of them.
- Do you know Cargo Coffee on E Washington? There are some plants trying to grow up the wall there. I don't think it's successful, is this anything like that?
- I do, I have not noticed the climbing vines that are not doing well there, but now I'm curious to look next time I go through there.

- Unfortunately, I don't have firsthand knowledge of that one, but I like that you're paying attention to that. I've seen many representations of that not looking well, usually we see very optimistic renderings. That said, I'm trying to picture Cargo Coffee, and I think there is more pavement and urban reflected heat on that space, where this has a significant planting area along the foundation, and in the foreground. Unlike the shelter it is at grade, not on top of a structure or roof, this is a good scenario to be successful. These plants are potentially too aggressive, but that's probably better than the opposite. I like this. I look at these structures as a texture piece even if the vine doesn't do well, there's a break in materiality and texture.
- Overall comments on adequacy of the landscape design?
- I think it looks great, the species and selections are nice, it's improved in the swaths of seating areas. And as I mentioned last time, the busy materiality, fun and funky but too chaotic that we previously saw has been refined a great deal. It's colorful and fun, I like the project and the preservation of mature trees, although optimistic, they are close to disturbance and grading, it's a nice benefit and positive attribute. Thumbs up from my perspective.
- My hat to them for the efforts to preserve the big trees close to the building. It's nice to see the plant palette they are using and see the effort. The lawn areas are a nice asset, they added native plants, oak trees.
- Complement more purposeful color of panels, more successful with gradient and helps define hierarchy. Landscape work has much improved. Findings related to some of the blank walls, I think those are not as noticeable on these longer façades, but some of the shorter ones, in particular the south elevation seems to have lack of more detail. It would be nice to have more articulation or design focus on that area.
- Do you think it could be augmented with some landscaping?
- Yes, I do.
- It's over by the service and loading area.
- Wondering if there's an opportunity for screening just to the right of service and loading.

Action

On a motion by von Below, seconded by Bernau, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-1-1) with von Below, Bernau, Harper, Rummel, and Klehr voting yes; Asad recused; and Goodhart non-voting.

The motion passed with the following:

- Screening shall be added at the service area.
- The continued review of lighting can be completed administratively.