

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** September 5, 2012

TITLE: 448 South Park Street – PUD(GDP-SIP)  
Urban Mixed-Use Development Including  
Retail and Residential in UDD No. 7. 13<sup>th</sup>  
Ald. Dist. (27550)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: September 5, 2012

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, Melissa Huggins, Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant, John Harrington and Cliff Goodhart.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of September 5, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 448 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Duane Steinhauer, Joseph Lee, representing JLA Architects; and Sue Ellingson, District 13 Alder. Registered and speaking in opposition was Amy Moran. Registered in opposition but not wishing to speak were Helen Kitchel, Steve Hoffenberg and Sue Hoffenberg. Plans were presented for a mixed-use 5-story building with retail on the ground floor and 40-units of residential above. Parking would be below ground with some parking along the back of the building off of Park Street for the retail uses. They have been watching the progression of The Ideal building and their intent is to not impede on the neighborhood to the west, keeping the entire mass of the building on Park Street. Architecturally the building is contemporary/modern/industrial in aesthetic. The corner of Park and Drake Streets is the major architectural element of the building with the rest of the site in simple massing and forms. After four stories the building steps back 6-feet with a potential of stepping back even more if they shift everything over, which brings the mass closer to the residences. This keeps the building as close to Park Street as possible. Planning Division issues raised include the fact that this development (versus The Ideal) does not encroach into the neighborhood beyond the original commercial core; this maintains the existing commercial core while benefitting from the backside setback that acts as a physical buffer. Staff noted that issues in regards to the design guidelines range from the setback rationale (beyond the programming), what are the obstacles and what does it do to the design? The corner element could be stronger, and the post at the corner needs to be strong enough to carry that load. The strong masonry building is appreciated, but should there be more of a difference with the brick or should they be the same? A strong masonry form like this should have lintels and sills somewhere. A stronger address of the criteria is needed relative to the required stepback. Playing with the stepbacks would give stronger balcony elements. Lee responded that they would be willing to shift the whole mass but it’s counterintuitive to what they were wanting to do (moving closer to the existing residential). A number of the details need some looking at, in addition to the corner element. They respectfully disagree with the lintels and sills suggestion; a steel lintel with brick on a building like this is great, a precast sill could work.

Amy Moran spoke in opposition. She mentioned the petition of 200 signatures for The Ideal project, which also applies to this project in terms of the 5-stories on Park Street. The scale is so large and out of proportion to what the neighborhood is used to. The neighborhood prefers smaller scale businesses/retail with small commercial strips. The big concern is the replacement of an attainable level of height for the commercial strip with very large faces on the building so that the residences are now facing a different streetscape. The neighborhood in general sees the taller buildings as serving a public purpose (St. Mary's, the new health clinic) while these apartment buildings benefit the developers.

Duane Steinhauer spoke in support, asking if the City allows buildings to come out over the sidewalk for the use of arcades. If they could set the building back another 5-feet that could work, depending on how the building addresses the street.

Ald. Sue Ellingson spoke in support of the project. She thinks 5-stories is called for in this location and this is a very nice building. The stepback overall is a bad idea and they should do away with that requirement. This is nice to keep it tight to Park Street, out of the neighborhood, a great design and investment. Staff noted that the stepback is a provision of the UDD ordinance that requires address.

Discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- I'm very concerned with having the entryway to the residential area in the rear. This is a really beautiful building that deserves a front entrance; need a strong entry at streetside, a grand front entry (on Park or Drake Streets). I agree with staff comments in terms of the corner element but overall it's a very good project.
- Strengthen corner entry, make it not necessarily a symmetrical entry.
- The two-story reads are nice that are kind of reminiscent of Movin' Shoes. It makes the whole neighborhood fit together. The canopy being continuous along all of Park Street may be adding too strong of a one-story read from a distance; needs variation and undulate setback of façade at the street.
- This has a nice warehouse aesthetic.
- Need to look at signage as it relates to the building's architecture.
- Look at solar impacts on neighboring properties.
- Need to make a strong case relative to stepback issues.
- Look at repeating upper roof corner treatment at the north end.
- Look at different roof form on loft.
- Provide details on alley parking in relation to neighboring properties.

### **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 rating for this project is 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 448 South Park Street**

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

General Comments:

- Suggest a simple, elegant iconic building as a counterpoint to The Ideal.
- Love this building, right for Park Street.
- Put the door on Drake Street. Make case for no stepback. Very attractive building, good start.