

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** July 29, 2015

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

REPORTED BACK:

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

DATED: July 29, 2015 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Lois Braun-Oddo, Richard Slayton, Tom DeChant, Dawn O’Kroley, John Harrington, Sheri Carter and Michael Rosenblum.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 29, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of an Amended PD(GDP-SIP) located at 1004 & 1032 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jeanine Glaeser, Randy Bruce, Rich Strohmenger, Jeff Felland and Jon Hepner, representing T. Wall. Registered neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak were Steve Vanko and Helen Kitchel. Registered and speaking in opposition were Carrie Rothburd and Jane Elmer. Glaeser presented changes and updates to the project including landscaping and stormwater management.

Carrie Rothburd spoke to the erosion control plan, noting that at some point along the process the neighborhood got left out. Given the history of problems with other parts of the site and the proximity of the bay this erosion control plan can and needs to be better. She asks for reassurances that the bay will not be contaminated by construction materials. She questions the relevancy of the City’s adopted plans and how they play into the approval process for this development.

Helen Kitchel spoke as a Friend of Monona Bay. Her concerns are with erosion control during construction, as well as stormwater control during construction and after construction. There will be water on this site when they start digging; we need to know how that water will be contained, treated and how and where it will be discharged. The Friends of Monona Bay will gladly work with the developer on these issues.

Steve Vanko spoke in opposition. The stormwater management is not going to be sufficient. Impervious sidewalks and driveways don’t drain.

Jeff Felland stated that the erosion control plan contains “standard practices.” The Secretary mentioned that citizens can and should call Rob Phillips, City Engineer regarding their concerns.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Question the appearance of brackets at cornice on prow; the cornice brackets are 19th Century decorative. Need context for window changes comparing how windows are handled on the other flat iron buildings.
- Change stone above garage to metal or apply stone around base of flat iron.
- Question the need for cornice on prow, need more detail as an expression of flat iron.
- Prefer fly swatter to the previous cornice treatment.
- Articulate vertical to articulate support for flat iron.
- Like cornice with vertical fins.
- Missing windows on upper prow along Park Street in the rendering.
- Mix on new green roof, sedum lack permeability. Need something to take water up with plants that transpires, look at necessary soil depths with alternative plantings.
- Concern with small trees in right-of-way; need larger trees in right-of-way.
- Stories are of merit.
- Need unique treatment of flat iron portion of the building.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rosenblum, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0).

- Communicate with City Engineering on concerns on stormwater, erosion and other related issues with enhanced enforcement to eliminate potential impacts on the Monona Bay, in memo to be drafted by staff.
- Use brick from middle section on lower façade of flat iron.
- Remedy missing window on upper prow elevation on Park Street.
- Align windows on Park Street at jambs and line of mullions.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall rating for this project is 4.

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
Member Ratings	6	6	6+	-	-	-	-	-
	4	4	3	-	-	4	4	4

General Comments:

- Sense of place along street is missing on Park Street. Needs large trees!
- Continues to get better, flat iron component can still be stronger, better resolved.
- A background building at best.