

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: February 12, 2020

TITLE: 202 N. First Street – Public Building,
Madison Public Market Located in UDD
No. 4. 12th Ald. Dist. (56314)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: February 12, 2020

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Craig Weisensel, Rafeeq Asad, Christian Harper, Lois Braun-Oddo, Shane Bernau, Syed Abbas and Jessica Klehr.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 12, 2020, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the Madison Public Market located at 202 N. First Street in UDD No. 4. Registered in support of the project were Ken Saiki and Kathleen Ferrero, representing Saiki Design; Mitch Karr, representing the City of Madison; Megan Bellard and Brent Pauba.

The finance representative talked about the City’s investment in the building and support of the market at the corner of N. First Street and E. Johnson Street. They reviewed the site location of the City’s Fleet Services, contextual views of the site and area, and the existing building, as well as adjacent amenities. The railroad is the separator but it is still close to an outdoor park. They reviewed the site plan and civil plans. Stormwater will be stored underground for water reuse and stewardship. N. First Street will have large patios and vendor spaces around the perimeter of site. There will be a mix of small bistro areas, a series of front porches, it will be heavily planted with lots of trees and small scale seating. There are large format garage doors and some existing openings will be filled with storefronts. E. Johnson Street will be a new bike thoroughfare and there will be a bike corral at the corner of the site for 90 bicycles that will be screened by trees and plantings. Each section of the patio will have bike parking, one section will be BCycle. The market does not have a main entrance per say. The south side of the site is mainly parking. There is a small canopy for entries. The northeast side of the site has an auto access drive. The south part of the lot has large trees and plantings to screen the fleet refueling depot. A review of the lighting plan noted that the site will be dark sky certified with sensors to dim down at night. They are seeking LEED minimum requirements. The Kalwall will be removed to become fully transparent and all the windows will go down to grade. The roof plan layout shows it will be covered by photovoltaics. They reviewed the overall floor plans. The trash enclosure and loading dock area will have some fencing. There will be a rain garden adjacent to the enclosure. Interior views of building were shown, as well as exterior elevation views. They have repainted the EIFS and replaced the lower portion with a more resilient EIFS system than what was originally installed. There is room for future mural installations. Signage will be part of a future package. On the N. First Street façade, all openings will be protected with air curtains. On the south façade on E. Washington Avenue they are currently looking at options for replacing the Kalwall with glazing. Images of future signage and murals was shown.

The Commission discussed the following:

- On the south elevation, if you can't afford to do a curtain wall, what will it look like?
 - We don't have photos.
- Will there be Madison Market signage on the prominent side of the building?
 - The spaces have different functions. The main hall is the core market and entry hall. We do not have large format signage planned. The typography could change depending upon the branding consultant.
- You didn't say anything about a tall feature.
 - That's something we had to value engineer. There's a lot of pulls on the money for this site. We're also trying to prioritize things for vendors, i.e. range hoods, etc. It's better to spend the money elsewhere.
- I saw it on the documents on Legistar.
- You're showing a lot of EIFS around the base – have you thought of another material?
 - Yes, we did early on. We looked at options, one was a landscape berm. EIFS was the most economical solution. We do like the system, so much of this building is intended to be a blank wall. The EIFS will be a high impact, a much more robust system and should hold up.
- Typically we don't like EIFS unless it's up higher on the building. Has that been talked through?
 - The original intent was to spend the money inside. We wanted to freshen up the façade, without spending a lot of money on it.
- This concerns me. You'll need an amount of money for future repairs. It just doesn't last at the ground.
- The roof screen, you showed examples but will it be visible from street?
 - The screening is there. We'd rather spend money on the vendors. If there is a concern, it will be there.
- I'll comment on the plants on north side of building – tucked in northeast corner. You might want to revisit the selections to make sure they can tolerate the shade.
- On the south side of the building I see from overhead photos, there's quite a row of trees there. I assume mostly on the sewer district property. Are they intended to stay as a redo of the alleyway on that side of the building? Does shade cast by those impact the whole thinking of windows on that side of building?
 - The property line is right next to the building. They were to remain, but already removed. We have considered replanting trees to the degree that we can. It's complicated with the in-grade equipment.
- The trees in the photo are already gone?
 - Yes all trees were removed for the drive. MMSD requested we not plan on that side.
- The murals – is your thinking on those that the request would go out, more or less permanent or rotating a 3-5 year mural and then new ones go up? It would be nice to get something fresh and give new artists an opportunity. Any thoughts?
 - We haven't established what will happen. The media encourages a 3-4 year strategy. There may be way the foundation handles this, or it may be a living art gallery. There is a % for art component in the budget.
- Initial approval is based on massing and the overall site design. Final would be everything. In terms of issues with the curtain wall glazing, I didn't know it glazed. And materials can be something to grant final approval at a staff level. We should see materials for final.
 - Yes, we have the EIFS and metal window color.
- I'm not concerned about the color. These are highly public and trafficked areas. We don't have a history of approving EIFS to the ground. I don't know.
- We could give initial approval with specific directions.

- I'll clarify to make sure it's clear on south elevation if staying – existing and include photos of what it looks like.
- We might benefit from exhibits, where the EIFS is in contact with equipment and people. Demonstrate where it is vulnerable, and demonstrate its long-term viability.

ACTION:

On a motion by Asad, seconded by Bernau, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion for approval provided for the following:

- Revisit the landscape plantings near the northern inside corner of the building to verify that they can tolerate a lot of shade.
- Further investigate where the external EIFS cladding material will need to be replaced, such as where it is in contact with the ground. Provide exhibits that show where on the building the EIFS material would be at risk of being damaged due to being in contact with people or mechanical equipment, versus areas where it is protected by landscaping and can be demonstrated not to be vulnerable to damage.
- Provide more information on the long-term viability of the external high impact EIFS material proposed.
- Keep the rooftop mechanical screening. On the Southern elevation, clarify what is existing equipment and what is proposed.
- Clarification regarding the window system of the southern façade, confirm whether it will be a new glass curtain wall system or remain as the existing kalwall system.