

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** March 23, 2016

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:

*Modifications to previously approved
plans, rooftop equipment* **REPORTED BACK:**

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

DATED: March 23, 2016 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant, and Richard Slayton.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 23, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of modifications to previously approved plans for rooftop equipment located at 448 South Park Street in UDD No. 7. Appearing on behalf of the project were Kirk Biodrowski, Forrest Heaney and Nate Warnke, representing Rockhound Brewery. With the stairwell and the elevator core, there is no way for them to take the exhaust to the backside or to the flat roof. The mechanicals are now located on the gabled roof and show prominently on Park Street and are not screened. They propose to screen the mechanicals with the hardiboard that is being used elsewhere on the building to maintain the seams and context with the building.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I’m still troubled by the gable.
- One idea is to wrap the entire roofline and have a better form that goes better with the building architecture. The gable was barely approved.
- This build-out had a vent plan as part of the PUD. The contractor came to the City saying he could not meet that plan, and asked to switch around some vents on the ground floor level. There was no mention of the mechanicals being put in this location on the roof. The Building Inspection Division noted that this work was on-going for months without approvals (staff). The District Alder does support the project, however, the PUD standards and the Urban Design District do not allow for this.
- I remember we talked about this building having an industrial feel to it. We did approve the gable. A lot of times in industrial buildings these kind of elements are done in a series and they are celebrated. I think that the photographs with it and without the screen wall, I’d prefer just having the equipment. If instead of building a big box around it, painting the entire rooftop equipment a dark black would make it look like a design industrial element. I don’t know that we can really push for putting a parapet on this

entire roof and having that additional mass up there. I'm not sure we'd be happy with that either. I'm not sure it would be an aesthetic improvement.

- It's required to have it screened. The Zoning Code requires all rooftop utilities to be screened. It is also an issue with its "PD" zoning and it being in an Urban Design District (staff).
- I think the screen wall is an afterthought calling attention to something that's behind there.
- I understand that, but at the same time they don't get a "get out of jail free" pass, that's not plausible. That's a land use consideration that goes beyond design because you're asking for something that the Zoning Code does not allow, is not part of the approval process (staff).
- If it wasn't for the peaked roof I might buy it. But once we approved that peaked roof, it took it out of that industrial kind of mode.
- If you look at pictures 4 and 5, the doors that open onto the porch are they remaining white? That seems like "huh" compared to everything else.
- What about a cylindrical screen?
 - From a practical standpoint we need 2-feet around it, plus they need another 42-inches on one side so they can flip it open and clean it out. It can be circular but it would be quite large.
- It's an obstruction either way, whether it's circular or a big box.
- What if this were looked at like an extended wall situation? What if the gable end became a rectilinear shape as a parapet on the end and you build parapets up and make it square on the ends. Add two more kind of fins on the end so it's four fins. I don't know if you can change the gable end at this point. Adding to the composition. I'd take the face of the gable and continue building that wall up.
- If you took the end towards the south of the building and made that a square...it looks so strange because you have this gable ended things on both sides. None of this is going to be good, frankly, the question is what do we find acceptable, and this isn't it, particularly since it wasn't approved.
- There needs to be a railing? This could be a wire mesh kind of cage enclosure, more industrial.
 - The railing is needed for maintenance.
- That little extra jog makes no sense up there.
 - That was the minimum we needed for the guardrail.
- There is not a permit that's been signed off by Zoning that says "this is OK." The work was just done (staff).
- Is there any opportunity to put that fin in the flat roof section?
- Since this project was at the Commission there was a series of alterations to meet accessibility up there for that room and the way it was used. Most of the area around it is dedicated to accessibility and fire access requirements, which exacerbates this a bit more.
 - There's nowhere else to put this. The gabled roof isn't the ideal place to put it, but we just can't do anything else at this point.
- Is there alternative technology to this?
- I would say you either approve it the way it's done, or the recommendation that they come up with a screen to approve administratively.
- I'd like to see some more creative alternatives that are integrated into the design versus just trying to put a gray box around it.
 - Architecturally without reconfiguring the building, getting rid of the gable, I don't really know what else to do. I have an owner trying to open a restaurant who has every penny into this and is about to go broke. We're at our last straw.
- The Commission is not holding up occupancy of this building in any kind of fashion with this issue. Your owner needs to work with the building owner, to work with Building Inspection and the Fire Department on issues of occupancy (staff).
- This was brought to my attention, my project manager's attention and my architect's attention on March 11th. The building owner has not been cooperative or forthcoming with help, financially or with the

design. If you for changes to the roof to put the whole thing screened, he'll make me pay for that. If you ask for anything more than what's there, he's already asking me to pay for that. This has become a tenant problem in his mind. He approved the restaurant, he put in the grease duct himself that goes to the roof. We put in the equipment with the understanding that it was approved. It's a building owner problem and I'm caught in the middle. I was ready to open a week and a half ago (Nate Warnke, one of the owners of Rockhound Brewery).

- This issue will have to be resolved once there's a decision on it. It will not hold up your occupancy permit unless there's a public safety issue.
- If you simply squared this off on both sides, in terms of cost effect here that's a modest proposal.
- What is approved and what is not approved, because we're talking about more than just the physical actual vent.
- They just did it in conjunction with running the chase inside. As you go up the building to accommodate this, how come nobody came to us and said we're changing this and we need an approval.
 - The intake vents was a different contractor. This other part is something that was inherent from the building and our HVAC guy put the equipment on top of the curve that was already existing. This is what Nate said we found out about on March 11th and we've been scrambling ever since.
- The design of the non-compliant "penthouse" is really the solution and the entire integrated solution of that penthouse is what would resolve this exposed vent. It might be nice if the design team presented that.
- Do you want to see it, or do you want to make a motion to reduce the profile by eliminating the box and mount the equipment so it's less high and more directly screened without the enhancement of being projected higher.
- I think it should be referred with the direction to look at alternative forms, materials and other solutions to integrate the roof screen into the overall design, even if that includes consulting with the original designer.
- The solution could be a more industrial screen.
 - Now you're introducing a whole new material to the building that doesn't exist. Now we're accentuating the thing that doesn't exist even more by adding another material.
- You may be right, but at the moment we're not convinced that this is something we would approve and we're giving you the chance to come back with something we can approve.

ACTION:

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