

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: May 7, 2014

TITLE: 448 South Park Street – PD(GDP-SIP) Six-Story Mixed-Use Building Including Retail and Residential in UDD No. 7. 13th Ald. Dist. (27550)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 7, 2014

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair;

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 7, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PD(GDP-SIP) located at 448 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Joseph Lee, representing JD McCormick Company. The Secretary stated that the changes to this project include walpaks, entry treatment, and a change from aluminum windows to fiberglass windows. Lee presented changes in unit plans that require the change of some magicpak louvers on the Park Street elevation with the addition of three louvers to the top floor, which is stepped back approximately 5-feet. On the back elevation facing the parking lot they have added a band of louvers next to the metal bay, and on the alley side they added a band, venting for the elevator and for the parking. They will be painted the same color as the surrounding material. For the bay at the corner of Park Street and Drake Street, as well as the corner of the alley and Drake Street on the backside, the original approval noted an option for fiber cement or metal panels; they would like approval of fiber cement. Masonry and utility sized red brick will be used, with masonry being used up to the fourth floor. Lastly fiberglass windows are being introduced. The Secretary noted concern with using fiber cement at the entry feature. The Commission’s previous review of the project made it very clear that the use of aluminum framed awning and windows was a requirement. Fiberglass windows were not approved on “The Ideal” project as the buildings are supposed to emulate the industrial feel of the neighborhood.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- This is a painted system so the material behind it is secondary to the actual industrial look. I was skeptical you could get an authentic clear anodized look in the fiberglass, so in my mind it’s a different scenario because it’s a painted product. The storefronts on the ground floor are still aluminum?
- My global comment is that this image and the industrial feel that are in the UDC guidelines, is not represented in that elevation. It’s been lost.
- More has changed than what we’re talked about.
- The windows always were dark, but going from a reflective metal material to a painted hardi-product pulls it away from that character.

- That corner window treatment is different too.
- I share the observation that the industrial look is gone. This third brick color doesn't show here.
- You used to have a four-story corner metal element that was clipped onto a brick solid corner. You could read that corner volume as a mass. You've lost that parapet so you've lost that proportion. And the base, you're talking about metal on the base, but in this rendition your entire first floor corner was brick.
- On the corner itself the proportion of the windows was less deep or less high than it was on this elevation. That glass look, that warehouse appearance is gone.
- On the issue of the walpaks, the north elevation seems a little strange because they're staggering up that side. They're clearly not a design thing, they're just popped through the openings. You're going to see that coming down Park Street, to a degree. Only two of them are lined up, at least on the drawing.
- On the west elevation, the far right brick bay where you have them located in that brick, that location takes away the integrity of the brick mass. We looked at them as an opening when you have a brick mass, so I feel that placement reduces the quality of the character of having brick on that elevation.
- Can you take those and incorporate them behind the balcony or on the porch?
 - For some of them that's not an option. Unless you compromise the livability of the unit.
- On the west elevation where you added them they also seem to drop below the line of the windows right next to them but they seem to be the same dimension and height as the windows right next to them. They're all just slipped down from the window base.
 - There are limitations to where you can put those based on the unit. I can bring them up off the floor a little bit.
- Issues with this lack of integration, dealing with HVAC equipment and utilities have always been part of our approval process.
- It's a little strange to bring a board showing a brick size and then say that's not it, it's a different size.
- Changes should be marked on plans saying this is what we're asking approval for, I shouldn't have to ask you what it really is. There should be no confusion about what you're asking for approval on.
- It doesn't feel like what we're seeing here (in elevation versus renderings and elevations as originally approved). Even the west elevation, the last column is off-kilter, it's different, it's not aligned at least on the top. I think there are a couple of moving parts that you could do better on.
- The walpaks disappear more for me in the gray brick than they do in the brown brick; attempt to integrate them in panel jointing, show alternative to light brick.
- With the integration maybe it's an expansion of the louvers, or maybe it's a grouping of them, maybe it's integrated into the panel jointing, maybe you alter the lines of the panel so that the louvers are integrated into that.

ACTION:

On a motion by Cnare, seconded by O'Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** this item. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (5-0). The motion to refer provided that the applicant resolve inconsistent alignment, detailing and proportions of elevational features as originally approved with true material samples, especially clean-up the Drake Street elevation.