City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT	OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: June 5, 2013			
TITLE:	222 & 224 State Street – Exterior Remodeling in the Downtown Core	REFERRED:			
	District. 4 th Ald. Dist. (30402)	REREFERRED:			
		REPORTED BACK:			
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary		ADOPTED:	POF:		
DATED: June 5, 2013		ID NUMBER:			

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Melissa Huggins, Richard Slayton, Dawn O'Kroley, Lauren Cnare and Henry Lufler.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 5, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for exterior remodeling in the Downtown Core District located at 222 and 224 State Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jerry Bourquin and Isaac Wallace, the project architects; Dave Martin and Sean Baxter. The Secretary noted that concerns were expressed about why the applicant is maintaining a modern storefront as it exists now on a reskinned building when you're trying for a more traditional approach on the upper elevations; simplifying the material palette; the introduction of balconies with a 90° door that doesn't put glass facing State Street; on the backside a base treatment is needed. Bourquin presented the plans for turning the upper three floors of this building from office space into residential, as well as giving the building a new skin. The existing brick would remain the same with new brick behind the balconies; a contrasting brick would also be used. The smaller bedroom area would be veneer stone. The first floor retail will remain unchanged, as will the back parking area behind the building, with the exception of potentially including trash enclosures. They are proposing to punch more windows in the upper levels, keep the same EIFS but give it a new coating.

Sean Baxter, the property owner talked briefly about trying to return the character to what the rest of the context is along State Street. He was having a hard time visualizing what modern is in the context of smaller scale storefront 19th Century architecture along State Street, without sticking out. The Chair noted that new construction doesn't necessarily need to mimic old construction; new construction is contemporary and period. Block 100 was cited as an example. Picking up on the pattern language of what you're surrounded by will help you fit in.

Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- It feels like you're trying to make the building something it wasn't. I want to see something clean and modern. Study your neighbors in a current modern dialogue.
- New construction should not try to mimic old. It's a modern building with its own aesthetic values.

- It's like you're trying to create a 19th Century building where somebody came along and put a 1980s storefront, but in fact this is a 1980s-something building. You should take a more contemporary approach.
- You can have windows of different scale and proportion that imply a smaller use rather than a 1980s office. With your window articulation you can make us, from the street, see that it's residential.
- Look at how your balconies "touch" the neighboring building, that doesn't look appropriate. Look to something more linear that directly addresses the street.
- I don't know that you need three different expressions across 50-feet.
- What's there now has integrity.
- Think about the first floor and how it sets the tone as you go up. One of the things about the integrity now are the broad stripes across. Think of it as one mass.
- The success of this comes from how you juxtapose the modern look into the existing State Street fabric, and it's not by adding to the decoration of the existing building.

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 5, 5 and 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 222 & 224 State Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	5	-	-	-	-	4	5
	-	4	-	-	-	-	5	5
	-	4	-	-	6	-	6	5

General Comments:

• Encourage a more contemporary expression. No Olde Towne. Too busy.