

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

**REPORT OF:** URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** January 8, 2014

**TITLE:** 441 North Frances Street – Revisions to a  
Previously Approved Project – The Hub at  
Madison. 4<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (32683)      **REFERRED:**  
**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

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

**DATED:** January 8, 2014      **ID NUMBER:**

---

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

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of January 8, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of four out of five changes to the approved project at 441 North Frances Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Jeff Zelisko. Zelisko noted the five (5) proposed architectural and financial revisions to the project:

- (#1) Lower cantilevered cornice by 5’, change wall above windows to articulate cast concrete, change guardrail at pool terrace to all-glass with 12” high x 4” projected fascia below. (Supported by staff)
  - There was a serious constructability issue and they feel this looks cleaner.
- (#2) Change masonry Color #2 (grey) standard sized brick (7 3/8” x 2 1/4”) to utility brick (11 5/8” x 3 5/8”) at tower portion of building.
  - This brick never meets the street. This color is softer and lighter.
- (#3) Change burnished cast from 16” x 4” to 16” x 8”.
- (#4) Change burnished stone to masonry Color #34 (white) utility brick (11 5/8” x 3 5/8”) at courtyard.
  - This is a very expensive material. It’s very difficult to see this material outside of the courtyard.
- (#5) Change portion of recessed glass wall at second floor terrace to burnished cast masonry.
  - This won’t be seen from the street.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Do you have any perspectives of the infill? I’m having a hard time picturing it.
  - These images point to the fact that it’s hard to see from another location. We were concerned about that courtyard being dark.
- That second floor level is basically a glass storefront so introducing a masonry panel didn’t seem to make a lot of sense as far as what was there. It’s sort of odd.
  - That was before the plan had really started to evolve. We could make it frosted glass but I think that’s spandrel and I don’t know if that’s acceptable.

- This composition is several different elements, and each element has its own composition. Looking at that large tower that you're proposing going to the larger scale material, that's the piece I felt we always struggled with and I don't know that a larger material is an improvement. That's the piece I have the biggest difficulty with.
  - We felt at that location that it's really a monolithic element. I see the brick elements playing off of the windows and balconies. I share your sentiment but being that it's not near the street we felt we weren't going to be able to pick up the difference.
- The cast stone elements on the other elevation, that I can perceive those as larger cast stone panels. They wouldn't need to be the height that you're proposing.
- How durable is that glass and how often do you have to replace it?
  - It's a very thick glass, it would not be replaced than any other glass, it's a very expensive detail to have that be so simple. You can't even access that area by foot.
- Does anyone on the Commission feel that the contrast with brick colors is compromised?
  - A little bit.
  - This has a little bit more yellow, the original is a little bluer. (Zelisko)
- My biggest concern is the proportion of the burnished masonry because it has the concrete block proportion.
  - That's a stacked bond so it differentiates the character. I felt it was important to differentiate it. My concern is it's going to look like concrete block up there. Because of its proportion I prefer some more horizontal. Particularly on that second floor, I would prefer the spandrel.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Cnare, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission separated this item into five (5) motions to be voted on separately.

#1: The Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the change to the cornice. The motion passed on a vote of (5-0).

#2: The Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** to change the masonry and size of the brick on the tower. The motion passed on a vote of (3-2) with Slayton and O'Kroley voting no.

#3: The Urban Design Commission **DENIED** the change of burnished stone from 16" x 4" to 16" x 8". The motion failed on a vote of (2-3) with Huggins and Cnare voting yes; Slayton, O'Kroley and Goodhart voting no.

#4: The Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** to change the burnished masonry color brick in the courtyard. The motion passed on a vote of (3-2) with Huggins and O'Kroley voting no.

#5: The Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** to change a portion of the recessed glass wall to spandrel panels. The motion passed on a vote of (4-1) with O'Kroley voting no.