

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** December 19, 2012

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

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** December 19, 2012

**ID NUMBER:**

---

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

\*Slayton recused himself.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of December 19, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the new Access Community Health Services Clinic located at 2202 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Joanne Holland and David Hoffman. Hoffman addressed the comments from the Commission’s previous review of the project. They are proposing 26 trees to be planted; the original master plan for the mall showed 21 trees within the same area. Pedestrian connections back to the Urban League building were previously discussed and are now highlighted on plans to better show connections. The balcony now has masonry piers and columns that are pulled back closer to the building to allow for pedestrian circulation. On the north elevation the number of windows has gone from 5 to 3 because of the location of the utility room. The large areas of masonry on two elevations were looked at and now include 8-inch squares in addition to the 8 x 16 squares and adds a level of interest to the building while breaking up the large areas. To break up the large areas of corrugated metal they have introduced a line (strip) in a different pattern of metal to break that up. The last item commented on by the Commission were the sun shades on the south elevation. They did consider that in terms of the design of the building and pulled them off to keep it consistent on all sides, with as few projections out from the plane of the façade as they could manage. Issues with glazing were also considered.

Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- I want to be sure that the number of trees shown on the master plan are going to be included.
  - The canopy always felt like a welcoming aspect from Park Street. When I look at your building elevations at 2-feet above the sidewalk, have you looked at trying to get your building floor elevation closer to the Park Street elevation so your entrance can be more contiguous?
    - There was a concern with the building just to the south that they got the floor elevation too low. We worked with CDA to make sure the floor elevation was set at the right level.
- The connection at Park Street at the canopy I recall being wider.  
Now we’ve got some steps coming up creating a garden area on the streetside of the canopy.

It's too bad you have to have the steps; it felt more connected last time. If that walk slides away from the building and you walk around the planters, that might be more accessible.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0-1) with Slayton recused. The motion noted that shade trees as depicted in the master plan are shown and maintained; make sure the floor level is consistent with Park Street; study eliminating steps at Park Street for accessibility.

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 and 8.

**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
<b>Member Ratings</b>	8	7	7	6	7	8	8	8
	6	7	6	-	-	5	7	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	7	6	7	-	-	6	7	7

General Comments:

- Thanks for incorporating Commission’s suggestions.
- Make sure street trees continue in front of building.
- Nice landscape and fit into mall plan.