

**AGENDA # 10**

City of Madison, Wisconsin

**REPORT OF:** URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** April 22, 2009

**TITLE:** 202 South Park Street – PUD-SIP for Chandler Street Façade and Emergency Generator Improvements. 13<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (12023)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

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

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** April 22, 2009

**ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Mark Smith, Todd Barnett, Dawn Weber, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Ron Luskin and Jay Ferm.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 22, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-SIP located at 202 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jody Shaw, representing Meriter Hospital; James Alt and Bob Kramer. The presentation team provided an overview of the modification as a response to the Commission’s previous review from the meeting of April 1, 2009 as follows:

- Changed the color of overhead doors.
- A Nichiha panel to match the adjacent existing panels of the upper building’s adjoining façade, along with use of Nichiha sandstone II panels to match adjacent building’s stone base.
- Use of EIFS sill and band to match the color of the existing adjacent building’s precast element is also proposed, along with a board form poured concrete base on the garage door north façade to match the existing poured concrete base on the existing adjacent structure.
- The treatment of the garage doors has been simplified with the elimination of the arch feature with a three grouping arched window openings provided on the side elevation of the addition.

Following review of a photometric plan the Commission noted the following:

- Improved with original building reading as a separate building.
- Center walpac between the arches.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Weber, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-1) with Luskin abstaining. The motion provided that the walpac be centered with arch openings with a darker infill provided within the existing arch openings at the loading dock.

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 ratings for this project are 6, 6, 6 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 202 South Park Street**

|                       | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>Member Ratings</b> | -         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | -             | 6              |
|                       | 8         | 6            | -              | 6                              | -     | 6                                   | 6             | 6              |
|                       | -         | 6            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | 6             | 6              |
|                       | -         | 6            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | 6             | -              |
|                       | -         | 7            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | 7             | 7              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |

General Comments:

- Ready for approval. Uninspired but fine.
- Why not all brick? Simple base without “band?”