

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: October 17, 2012

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

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: October 17, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, John Harrington, Henry Lufler, Cliff Goodhart and Tom DeChant.

*Rummel was excused at 5:45 p.m. during consideration of this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 17, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 448 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Joseph Lee, representing JLA Architects; and Ald. Sue Ellingson, District 13. Registered neither in support nor opposition was Cynthia Williams. Staff noted concerns with the setback, the systematic window pattern, consideration for operable windows, a different roof form for the loft and the treatment of the corner element at Park Street. Lee presented contextual images of the site and surrounding context. The project is a mixed-use, 5-story building with loft. The building is tight along Park Street with a zero lot line condition. The first floor will house retail along Park and Drake Streets, with a ramp goes down to underground parking for 40 spaces. The residential entrance is towards the back of the site; the developer does not want the entrance on Park Street due to the retail aspect maximizing the ground floor space along Park Street. There will be ten units per floor with the fifth floor having loft space in each unit. The guidelines suggest that there be a 15-foot setback along Park Street after the third floor; the applicant is proposing an 8-foot after the fourth floor, and 13-feet at the fifth floor. They feel it’s important to keep the building mass at Park Street where they have the right-of-way and a lot of vehicular traffic where the height is not as much of an impact. Masonry and either metal panels or fiber cement panels will be used, with a recessed orange fiber cement being used above the third floor. As you go around the building, the entire Park Street elevation is activated with windows, with some maybe becoming doors depending on the retail tenant. Prior to discussion by the Commission, staff noted that this item as posted on the agenda was for “Initial Approval;” where a public hearing notice had been mistakenly not provided as required by ordinance for properties in UDD No. 7. Therefore, this presentation could not be for a formal approval but for informational purposes only. Staff apologized for any inconvenience to the applicant, Ald. Ellingson and neighbors.

Discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- The relative lack of windows on the alley is of concern. Look at more windows as possible under the building code; the elevation is of high visibility going down Park Street.
 - We are restricted in number of windows allowed. Some of those are closets and bathrooms.
- What's your change in plane between your change in materials?
 - The thickness of materials.

That's an awfully big gesture for no change in depth. As you're coming down Park Street you'll perceive it's just a façade treatment and not a change in massing.

- In a modern aesthetic that's a little more acceptable.

Need more depth.

- I'm not understanding the change in materials and I'm concerned about the blankness of the wall. Need to relieve blank wall façade with its high visibility.
- That notch seems interesting but it doesn't carry through as much as it could. It comes down further on the other side; it needs to go down more or up, beyond what is designed.
- I would look at putting canopy trees on the side that doesn't have utility wires. I would look at something other than Serviceberry.
- I like many things about this building but you haven't persuaded me that we shouldn't have a main residential entrance on Drake Street. I'm also concerned about the north elevation; that will be very visible.
 - For the retail the developer is courting users that may take up to that amount of contiguous square feet. Market-wise it's pretty important to have that. And it has to work with the lower level parking.

If you had a lobby from Drake Street back in to where the stairs are you would still have a very large retail space; still need a residential entry on Drake Street.

- Eliminate the column at the corner of Drake and Park Streets, it may be just the perspective but it looks very cramped in there. If it could be cantilevered so you don't need the column; it's real tight getting in there with little planters under the canopy and I don't know what's going to grow in there. Think about that some more.
- You're proposing outdoor seating on Drake Street. If you do that, understand that the little strip of turf grass is going to be a bunch of stones and weeds. I would put a decent hedge of ornamental grass between the curve and the seating area. I'd also like to see more soft space around those trees so you may not need as much seating.
- You have more than 12 stalls in the back so you're going to need a planting island. I'd like you to give up a stall or two and work out a proper entrance to the residences off that parking lot so they're not squeezing between stalls. Make it its own special little entrance. Give it the dignity that the rest of the building has.
- The planting to the west along the screening fence looks like an attempt to soften it. It's urban, make it bold.
- The use of asphaltic roof materials on the pitched roof on the sixth floor do not go with the warehouse scale of the building, the Commission and staff noted the need for a metal roof type. As to the form of the roof flat versus gabled, loft or no loft, it generally accepted that the gable roof form was OK with a metal roof.
- In terms of feedback relative to the provisions of UDD No. 7, the Commission felt that the setback, building height and form was acceptable as proposed.
- You have a chance for secondary subtle reads from one bay to the next. That might bring some richness and make each bay feel different in scale. If they opened in different ways it would bring more life to it.
- The 45° is a very weak entry.

- We did raise that up and made a more substantial column.
I like the idea of exposed steel; I don't know if that bracing is giving the same girth of what really that column would be holding. Look at how that could be stronger.
- If you end up with one retail tenant, I'm concerned about this whole entire Park Street having no activity, and with just one door. Even if it is one tenant, the bay areas that are set back, they should read differently.
 - It's designed for flexibility depending on what the tenant needs are.
I would show it that way versus without. Even if you end up with one tenant at least it looks like a more active façade. I would redevelop your landscape plan along Park Street to strengthen those nodes.

Cynthia Williams spoke in opposition to the project being more than four stories. She stated that the neighborhood has generally felt that this is an attractive building in many ways than the previous one; it's busier looking now where they prefer the elegance and simplicity of the first iteration. She asked that they take into account the combined impact of these two buildings in such close proximity. It's going to be an enormous change for the neighborhood.

Ald. Sue Ellingson spoke in support. The density is appropriate for the area and for Park Street. It does need some windows on the north side.

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 6, 7, 7, 7 and 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
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	6	7	6	-	-	-	7	7
	6	8	6	7	-	8	10	8
	7	7	-	-	-	7	8	7
	6	7	6	-	-	-	6	6

General Comments:

- Rear of building as residential front door needs more thought. Make front door stronger if it stays in parking lot. Like industrial design approach. Relook north façade – viewshed from Park Street.
- With UDC suggestions, especially entrance on Drake Street, could be an 8.
- More windows on north. Very nice project.
- Drake entry?