

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: November 28, 2012

TITLE: 2202 South Park Street – New Access
Community Health Services Clinic at the
Village on Park in UDD No. 7. 14th Ald.
Dist. (27552)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: November 28, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, John Harrington, Melissa Huggins, Richard Slayton*, Cliff Goodhart and Tom DeChant.

*Slayton recused himself on this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 28, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a new Access Community Health Services Clinic located at 2202 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Steve Mason, David Hoffman and Joanne Holland. Mason gave a brief overview of the project to date. The pedestrian walkway will be extended along the edges of Park Street with the creation of a landscape space/entry court providing ties back to the existing sidewalk. Minor changes to the building include darker siding at the top. Materials include ribbed and smooth metal siding in charcoal, off-white and silver in a horizontal pattern, with a burnished face block at the bottom. The Secretary stated that the Villager Master Plan is the basis of review for this project, where the approved plan provides for an exception to the requirements of UDD No. 7, with the Urban Design Commission's action amending the plan. The building form was always envisioned as a 2-story building.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The second floor patio seems to be floating in space; it feels like it wants to be grounded somehow and have some relationship to the arcade.
 - The issue for us became one of running out of space. It would be almost in the sidewalk if it were at grade.
- The original outdoor space looked like it would be more shared common space for the whole Villager area.
- Is there some ability to recapture the canopy trees (envision with current version of the master plan).
 - In the tree islands maybe but not along the sidewalk. Parking is a big issue here.
- One of our comments last time was about the north elevation. In effect, comparing it to the original it features less interest with not more on that façade; you've taken two window bays out and removed the detailing that went with the overhang. You indicate in your comments that you had done something with the siding to create interest; can you tell me what that is?

- The north elevation changed because that area was modified to accommodate a specimen toilet and a desire to have greater use for a laboratory.
- How does the linkage to the library work?
 - If somebody is trying to exit the building they're going on the walkway from Park Street, up that link to this building.
- The watering down between informational and now is kind of disappointing (architecture).
 - We couldn't have a wall come out, it would be in the middle of the walkway. It does affect vision too.
- It looks like the burnished block will still have the horizontal accent bands?
 - No, they won't.

What about the sun shades suggested before for the south elevation?

The sun shades that were there before were part of a budgeting consideration and also a performance glass issue we went back and forth on. It's clear glass with reflective properties; with 70% visible light transmittance.

- The first edition was better (previous version).
- Because of the large expanse of metal panel the sun shades would really help to articulate that south elevation.
- I would encourage a change in course. Maybe instead of an 8", a 4", or slightly recessed in the mortar to deliver what this promise is and at least the introduction of the sun shades; it would really help tie that together.
 - We're starting to get mixed language now on the different elevations.

The north doesn't get the sun to require the shades.

- I'd like to see a better treatment to the balcony.
- Sun shades on the south façade.

ACTION:

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0). The motion required the project to come back with modifications to address the comments made relative to architectural details and landscaping, along with a revisit on the original version of the building's architecture and details and comments made, including the utilization of sunshades, grounding of the balcony and building materials as applied to the façade with signage to return for separate approval.

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 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2202 South Park Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	6	6	6	-	6	8	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	5	6	-	-	5	7	6

General Comments:

- Informational presentation was much more successful.
- Solar screening and second floor patio still need to be addressed.