

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: January 8, 2014

TITLE: 307 East Wilson Street – Exterior
Remodeling in the Downtown Core for
“Summit Credit Union.” 4th Ald. Dist.
(32614)

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, Richard Slayton and Lauren Cnare.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 8, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of exterior remodeling located at 307 East Wilson Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Peter Tan. This project is a remodeling of the exterior of the Summit Credit Union.

Staff noted the reason for the initial approval request comes from not having full rendered elevations and shadow lines; this is more conceptual. It’s here because under the new Zoning Code there are three different thresholds that projects in the Downtown Core can be reviewed under (Katherine Cornwell, Planning Division Director can approve them as a minor alteration under her own authority; or it can come to the Commission and the Commission can approve it under its own authority; or if it’s deemed major enough, it could go to the Urban Design Commission and the Plan Commission). Cornwell thought this design was too angular and Tan’s client is wedded to this particular design. The banner on the building basically meets the rules as a projecting sign. But then you have these other elements that project into the right-of-way and don’t have the clearance to be in the right-of-way and again, the coloration and patterning ties back to being “sign-like.” Less sign-like and more architectural. The right-of-way, less of an issue. The other ones on the long side of the building may be okay, but it depends on what they’re made out of. But again, attention getting, are these something we want to encourage as part of a façade in an urban setting, or are they more suburban attention getting devices? I think they need some work. Outside of the façade issues themselves, those banner elements would have to come back and be revisited. I would prefer there be more of an architectural element to the façade rather than graphic, because they appear to be very temporary in nature.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Initial approval is the re-cladding of a one-story building.
Staff noted that the signage package’s inclusion of various banner types need to come back after a review by Zoning on consistencies with the Sign Control Ordinance.

- The banner on the trellis on the left side of the site obscures and conflicts with the existing tree.
- I would offer that I think in the Zoning Code there is a restriction (or discouraging) of metal panel that is not heavy gauge and reflective, so this is not heavy gauge and reflective and it comes down to the ground. It is very angular. I'm also concerned that the two trellises there are going to compete with the tree. In the site plan I see it behind the tree. The project has that arch and I'm trying to picture it without that, the two piers seem so far separated from the building itself, so I'm wondering if you really need those. As far as architectural elements, look at those piers at East Campus Mall; they have a University logo and lights in them, they're very well done for their context.
- You have to show us where those signs come into the right-of-way, we don't have enough information. The other thing is "are they signs?" Outside of Matt Tucker's (Zoning Administrator) interpretation of a sign, and you're in the Downtown Core, you have my interpretation of a sign, they're a sign and I would not approve them. I would send them back to this body to make that determination. It's suburban.
- I don't object to the angularity. I'm so used to it I don't object to it, I find it a nice relief. I kind of like it.
- I won't vote for initial because I think it could come back as a comprehensive package for initial and final at the scale of what the project is.
- It's mostly the re-skinning. It's such a specific treatment to this building it almost should come back for initial/final with the elevations and shadow lines and all the materials designated on the elevations.
- I find it an interesting solution how you're enclosing the curb elements and I think it's a good thing, but it does feel like a big gesture on the roofline for a building of this scale in an urban setting.
- I'm concerned about the way it resolves itself down on the lower elevation. I'm not really sure how it drops down there and gets flat.
- Melissa did express to me that she didn't feel we had enough materials to make a decision on this item.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Cnare, seconded by Slayton, to grant initial approval. The motion was withdrawn by unanimous consent.

On a motion by O'Kroley, seconded by Cnare, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-0).