

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** April 8, 2015

TITLE: 1004 & 1032 South Park Street – Amended PD(GDP-SIP), Four Connected Mixed-Use Buildings in UDD No. 7. 13<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (36572)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: April 8, 2015

**ID NUMBER:**

---

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

\*Huggins recused herself on this item.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 8, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for an Amended PD(GDP-SIP) for four connected, mixed-use buildings in UDD No. 7 located at 1004 and 1032 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce and Janine Glaeser, representing T. Wall Enterprises. Registered neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak was Carrie Rothburd, representing the Bay Creek Neighborhood Association. Registered neither in support nor opposition and available to answer questions was Jeff Porter.

Since their last presentation with the Urban Design Commission they have had an additional neighborhood meeting. Bruce presented changes to the plans, which include moving from 6-stories to 5-stories at the request of the neighborhood and reduces the unit count to approximately 106-units. Additionally they have taken a more cohesive look at the architecture. Previously the modules were treated as individual components of a larger development; in this case they are looking at a more cohesive architectural treatment. They are using brick and infilling that with artificial metal panel using color to help accent that, and angular sun shades. They also eliminated the corner post that carried the balcony by bringing the first floor out to support the cantilever. Additional meetings with Traffic Engineering have resulted in a traffic impact analysis being done currently, as well as a general discussion about future plans for traffic improvements and pedestrian access.

Carrie Rothburd spoke, noting the neighborhood is pleased with T. Wall’s attempts to reach out to them and talk to them, as well as responding to their concerns. The Bay Creek neighborhood wants a development that fits in with the existing character of their neighborhood and builds upon what is there now.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Last time we talked about this being one whole building that holds the site, and this conversation now about breaking it up and going back into different colors seems to be going in a different direction. My

recollection of our last meeting was that the goal was for this to be one building that held the site with varying compositions and interest within one dialogue.

- The balconies, the previous relation did have more strength because as opposed to them feeling just tacked on lightly to the structure, which is kind of how it feels now with the prow, on the other option you had this cantilever that the body of the building was holding them out and projecting and reaching out to the street. So somehow bringing back the dialogue of the balcony being more integrated with the architecture would read stronger than a tacked on piece to fill the lot line.
  - We thought the idea was to get a cohesive architecture that really came up, wrapped around the corner piece in its entirety, I may have just misunderstood that.
- When I saw we had lost the corner element I was disappointed.
- The changing height doesn't seem to hurt the composition, but it lacks cohesiveness that still doesn't feel like one building, it feels like 3 or 4.
  - Here where we've got a uniform masonry color with alternate metal colors, does that tie it together more? We've got a very uniform type of skin that runs across there to tie it together. Is that getting to what you were suggesting?
- I don't know if it's getting to where we're suggesting but it's definitely a more cohesive composition than the later iteration with the various colors of masonry.
- I don't see a real hierarchy in the composition. If the verticals maybe were expressed, pushed out a few inches to have some kind of a rhythm along Park Street. I agree that it should be a strong single composition. It can have a lot of interesting elements, and I think you're getting there. I can see with some more detail and articulation that the whole composition of the building could have this real rich, detailed feel about it. I think it has a real strong potential with some more detailing and attention to that important corner.
- I could see these columns marching down and making the horizontals secondary in importance to those verticals. I think it's much better than before, I think it needs some closer study for the details. You haven't talked much about the bridge, but that could really be an interesting unifying element too.
  - Whether we're going to go with this version in a very cohesive manner, or whether we treat it as individuals, from our perspectives we thought Park Street is a major highway but it is still a neighborhood so we have to be careful about scale. We thought keeping it architecturally similar but using different colors would help with that.
- There are different experiences as you walk around the street. It doesn't feel like one mass. Imagine if you even just treat this bay and this bay differently. So it's broken up by architecture as opposed to just color.
  - This prow, that architecture where it's basically taking that masonry punched opening element around the prow, would this type of scenario be more appropriate?
- This seem much more appropriate, a masonry box that's holding a corner element. And the way you've intertwined them, and the masonry wrapping the corner, if you can just bring some of that dialogue through without losing the verticals.
- I find that masonry wrapped around the corner very disappointing. Looking at the original design the top of the building came out and sort of marked that. On your revised version you sort of stepped down from there and seems a little too light to me.
- If it were all glass and continued this read, as opposed to masonry, it might be more successful too.
- I don't see any placemaking at the street level.
- If you want to create a sense of place, I think you have to create that vibrancy and character and I don't see it here.
- The biggest problem would be if there are no occupants in those storefronts.
  - Were working towards creating more of an indoor/outdoor space in the corner, maybe this can open up. In the times of day and times of year it's appropriate, it can be opened up.

- Is there an opportunity for landscaping or terrace?
  - The terrace gets widened from about 3-feet to 6-feet. Then we setback off of that about 5-feet to our building edge so we do have the opportunity to do either hardscaping or landscaping treatments in that area.
- Can you look at increasing the setback at the smaller mass? Give those live-work units more of a terrace space.
- If you could open up and use those arches and have windows that open up completely, open up to the street, it's very effective for a sense of place.
- Parking on the street would help the commercial uses.
- On that vehicle entrance you may as well express that as a big entrance opening to the building and not just a void.

**ACTION:**

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

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1004 & 1032 South Park Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>								

General Comments:

- Improving! Expand placemaking.