City of Madison, Wisconsin

| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | | PRESENTED: November 5, 2014 | |
|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------|
| TITLE: | 22 South Carroll Street – Exterior Façade Improvements for "The Park Hotel" Located in the Downtown Core District. 4 th Ald. Dist. (35998) | REFERRED: | |
| | | REREFERRED: | |
| | | REPORTED BACK: | |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary | | ADOPTED: | POF: |
| DATED: November 5, 2014 | | ID NUMBER: | |

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O'Kroley, John Harrington, Lauren Cnare and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 5, 2014, the Urban Design Commission RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION for exterior façade improvements for "The Park Hotel" located at 22 South Carroll Street in the Downtown Core District. Appearing on behalf of the project were Melissa Destree, Brad Mullins, Susan Springman, Jason Ekstrom and Tyler Smith, all representing The Mullins Group; and George Wiesner. Mullins introduced the project, stating that they intend to stay open through this process and maintain access at all times to the property and facilities for their customers/guests. Destree presented the plans for the zero lot line property. There is currently EIFS on the building which will be repaired and enhanced; because of the structure they cannot put an additional load on the building. The brick elements will be kept and all of the windows will be replaced. They intend to "beef up" the base of the building in keeping with the improvements to the facade. The property will now be changing from its corporate name of "Inn on the Park" to be known as "The Park Hotel." They intend to integrate the different styles of the building so that the 1963 aspects and the 1983 aspects speak to each other a bit more. On Main Street they are proposing to tuckpoint the brick and install new windows, freshening up the EIFS between the windows, and curving the Square on the 9th floor. A dark granite face with stone with a sleek reveal on the center, a combination of bronze and brass infill window elements and railing detail on the third floor that has French balconies. The elevator overruns will penetrate about 40-inches to 5-feet into the Capitol view. Additional bicycle parking is proposed, as well as extension of the screening of the columns in front of the adjacent parking lot. They are currently working with the existing footprint of the first floor, with an addition of about 5,400 square feet on the ninth floor.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

• The 1980s piece that cantilevers over is quite strong. I see you're taking the approach to curve it but are moving in a more historic looking style, which makes the 70s and 80s pieces have less cohesiveness with the remainder of the building. I think you've got to work with what you've got, and you don't have a 1900 building. In terms of the articulation it should be more modern as opposed to applying historic-like elements. At the top corner, your 9th floor addition makes great sense and starts tying in with that

piece that cantilevers. I would not take away from that cantilever, let that piece be and let it continue to hover above. If anything I would be additive rather than subtractive. Canopies, a glass corner piece, something as an element of its own that adds to these pieces. I think the historic 3-story piece that you're adding against the 80% of the rest of the building, which is generally just having its windows replaced, will be a less cohesive composition than it is today.

- The owner wanted to get rid of the balconies on the project. We had looked at taking balconies off of the building. In regards to the historic nature of the base, I'd love to give more clarification; were using traditional materials, the owners are very interested in the interior having a very traditional feel, that will be renovated as well. Bringing that aesthetic from the interior to the exterior; we're intending that these elements are a contemporary interpretation. When you're on the street you'll feel a very contemporary interpretation of a traditional massing.
- Our preference would have been to maintain that prominent cantilever piece, which in its time was pretty neat. It's dated now and we're looking at refreshing and going a different direction. To harken back to being a premier hotel on the Capitol Square. It does lend itself to that 1960s look and feel. Balconies are just something tall hotels don't want to get into.
- It wouldn't have to be a balcony, I would look at adding a form, a building addition.
 - My fear is that it will be so costly that it wouldn't be practical. It's going to affect an awful lot of rooms, I don't know what it would actually be. If we get into more than the 20,000 square feet that would take it to another level, it would mean adding a sprinkler system and might move into the privilege in the streets category.
- I agree with the traditional design elements. You're really fighting against what you've got there. You've got a 3-story base, a 4-story middle and a 2-story top and it's just not working. I would strongly discourage you from going from 1960 to 1980 and then back to the teens of the 20th Century. We can't tell you what to do on the inside, but I would really encourage you to go with the streamline, really integrate what you see in that corner. A simple expression looks lighter, more airy and is certainly more consistent with the building that is there now.
- I really do appreciate that you're trying to do something with this property. This parking lot area, that wall is so prominent.
 - There are a good amount of trees there.
- It's not the top I'm worried about, it's that whole bottom area. Is there something that could be done?
- Maybe something like a trellis?
- The picket fence screening elements, if that were something more substantial, it would screen that blank wall a bit more and reinforce the street edge. Whether something that goes vertically or something built.
- If the corner stays that might save you some costs in some ways, and time. If you use that top as an expression of that period piece that's going to stay, think about how it could still be expressed in a way that fits that period.
- If you did a 2-story streetfront addition that just sang, this can be quieter and less detailed.
- What if you bring the line down so it lets you do a more significant entry?
- As you go up it loses that streamlined look that it had originally. You could have more continuity with the building above it.
- The curve looks like 1905, that's why I'm resistant to it.
- Staff summarized the minimal level of general modifications as simplifying the material palettes, doing a different parapet treatment that's thinner, a lot less heavy; same thing with the base of the building.
- (Steve Cover, Director, Department of Planning and Community & Economic Development) I like the curvilinear top, I think it's a massive improvement over what's there now. The curvilinear approach unifies that whole corner. I also like what is being proposed from the ground. You're taking a hotel that looks dated and making it look like a really nice, classy hotel. It does kind of have that Washington, D.C. look to it. We really like it.

ACTION:

Since this was an INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION no formal action was taken by the Commission.