

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: May 6, 2015

TITLE: 1004 & 1032 South Park Street – Amended PD(GDP-SIP), Four Connected Mixed-Use Buildings in UDD No. 7. 13th Ald. Dist. (36572)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 6, 2015

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant, Richard Slayton and Sheri Carter.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 6, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for an Amended PD(GDP-SIP) for four connected, mixed-use buildings located at 1004 & 1032 South Park Street in UDD No. 7. Appearing on behalf of the project were Rich Strohmenger, representing T. Wall; and T. Wall. Registered and speaking in opposition was Steve Vanko. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak was Jane Elmer. Registered neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak were Carrie Rothburd and David Vogel.

There has been another neighborhood meeting since the Commission’s last review of the project, mostly to discuss traffic and parking issues. From the neighborhood’s perspective the exterior architecture was not the paramount issue. The corner piece has been opened further giving 30-feet from the edge of the property to the building proper, making a large plaza space at grade. A good setback along Park Street and Fish Hatchery Road will give room for nice landscaping. A relatively consistent material palette is planned that will be used in slightly different ways.

Carrie Rothburd cannot support this project as of yet. The buildings are not yet the asset that they need to be to the neighborhood in order to warrant their size. They have yet to fully address any solutions to the issues they present in terms of traffic, parking, placement of entries and exits, all of this caused by the density of the building. The UDD No. 7 guidelines dictate that new buildings should be up to four stories, with bonus stories allowed depending on the project. This Commission has pointed out that the developer/architect is guilty of creating “more of the same.” It is still out of balance with the adjoining neighborhoods and doesn’t contribute to the guidelines call the character of the street. Please think about the long-term needs of the residents here.

Steve Vanko spoke in opposition. They still don’t know how many beds are proposed for the project. At one meeting there were balconies, then they were gone and now they’re back again. Park Street had a plan but in one swift meeting without many people knowing about it the plans changed for this property. There used to be a

lot of greenspace on this property. The neighborhood is worried that all the run-off of this is going to come into the bay.

David Vogel supports the building; it may not be architecturally quite what he likes. This type of architecture doesn't really make a statement. It is going to be harder for the neighborhood because of the mass, the increase in traffic, but it's a better thing for Madison. It will be a definite improvement from what's there.

The Secretary noted that no action would be taken at this meeting; the project will come back for a public hearing. This is in the Wingra Creek Area in UDD No. 7; however, design recommendations included in subsequent adopted plans for this area shall take precedent over requirements listed below (UDD requirements for this area). The adopted GPD takes precedence over the Urban Design District requirements. The GDP is viewed as consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the Wingra Creek BUILD Plan and the Park Street Revitalization Plan.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The panels on the balcony that are recessed in takes away from the verticality of that piece. Issue with metal panel in balcony insets beyond the "prowl." You have the flatiron with at strong line and then you have the masonry which is going vertical except that you continue this light metal line all the way through it.
 - We could take a look at the elevation. We did purposely have this horizontal and then we took from comments from the previous meeting, the idea of having this vertical rhythm. It's just those pieces on the balcony that strike me as breaking it up too much.
- Relook at the darkness of the brown brick.
- There is some concern about reflection from the metal panels.
 - We will look at our selection because this will be reflective.
- Was any thought given to stormwater management?
 - Essentially this courtyard is going to act as a stormwater management area. We've got a fair amount of landscaped areas that are absorbent. The whole roof deck is permeable to a point. The green roof systems are going to be more permeable. And then of course we've got the green areas around the outside of the building. We think that the courtyard really acts as a green roof also.
- I wonder why you can't just have one metal panel color throughout, really tie that all together. Why not just bring the brick all the way up? I think this as a full masonry façade might be as successful as what we see on Park Street.
 - The blue, green and red are in the shingle texture.
- Or a change in texture, same color. That's even more subtle.
 - Based on the comments about reflectivity it won't end up being silver. I do want to explore more ways to add color to the project. I understand the comments and they do make sense. Maybe right now we've taken it a bit too far, but there's some potential to do more of what you're talking about while still integrating color into the project.
- I'm hung up a little bit on the outstanding design. It's a good design; it distracts, the prowl has a "Trojan Horse" appearance. I do wonder how balconies fit in to an iconic feature at that corner, where people are sitting out there with plastic chairs and maybe that's where their bike will go. I'd start with something that is a curve.
- There are options you can do with the glass in the balconies to make it less clear.

ACTION:

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

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1004 & 1032 South Park Street

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

General Comments:

- Not there yet, see prior comments.