

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: January 28, 2015

TITLE: 22 South Carroll Street – Exterior Façade Improvements for “The Park Hotel” Located in the Downtown Core District. 4th Ald. Dist. (35998)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: January 28, 2015

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 28, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of exterior façade improvements located at 22 South Carroll Street for “The Park Hotel.” Appearing on behalf of the project were Melissa Destree, Susan Springman, Brad Mullins and Jason Ekstrom, representing The Mullins Group/The Park Hotel. Destree described the original structure from 1912 that was reskinned and renovated in 1940. Slabs of the building removed and heights of the floors were altered. In 1963 they added the corner element in the first three stories. In 1983 a very substantial addition was made to the building actually enclosing the rest of the portion of this building, overlapping the top at the curve and ending at the corner. We have a history of multiple additions which gives a design challenge with integrating and reskinning the façade. One approach was having the horizontal elements coming around and weaving together the vertical with the 3-story face. There was some discussion about the contrast and shadow contrast and whether or not that worked. Today they brought a solution for this area to continue and change the EIFS to hold the horizontal lines across, and as you turn the corner on Carroll Street they turn it compositionally with the guest room windows. This successfully addresses the concern and feedback they received from the Commission in regards to the “base, middle, top” expression of the structure by tying in the horizontal, as well as Main Street and the Carroll Street speaking directly to each other. The other issue was the base of the building. Previously they received feedback that there were some stylistic concerns with the railing detail, as well as too much of an interpretation of an Art Deco feel to the building. They’ve created a standard black granite base with the stone element, simple black granite accent at the top, and a simplified railing detail, removal of the greenish-black granite line and replaced that with Biezan limestone. They also removed the bracket detail at each of the windows but did retain the actual two-toned bronze stepback window, to stylistically maintain the architectural integrity of these elements and follow the design guidelines in regards to creating visual interest. This gives the exceptional quality of materials for the pedestrian experience. This will improve the view corridor, create a corner presence at the entry of the new restaurant, create the pedestrian experience and improve the Carroll and Main Street experiences. They have soft awnings at the storefront locations and hard awning at the hotel entry.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I'm seeing this as minor changes. Certainly the horizontal banding is an improvement on that, and I appreciate the level of detail and the fact that you did it in a week. But the concerns and comments that I made last time I still have, regarding the base in relation to the rest of the building. We seem to be harkening back to some detail and materials that seem to be almost like a revival style, where the building would have benefitted from more of a modern streamlined approach to this design update and detailing. I still see the first 3 stories as being really fussy when compared to the rest of the building design.
- I concur with that assessment, based on our previous meetings.
 - We did spend time in the last two weeks, we did a different 3-story base, which probably was more what you're speaking to. We spent a lot of time staring at them, trying to figure out if we liked them, and we decided we didn't because it was a hotel and it looked like a bank or an office building, it looked cold. We thought about submitting both.
- I appreciate the simplification of the horizontal banding. You've worked hard on this, people have different judgments.

ACTION:

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Cnare, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-2) with Huggins, Cnare, Slayton, DeChant and Harrington voting yes; Goodhart and O'Kroley voting no.

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 5, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 22 South Carroll Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	5	-	-	-	-	6	5
	-	5	-	7	-	7	9	5
	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-
	-	6	-	-	-	-	6	6

General Comments:

- Very compromised...though headed in the right direction.
- Art Deco revival not appropriate in building's evolution.
- Approved based on need for investment, not design. Should have respected mid-Century modern aesthetic much more.

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** January 14, 2015

TITLE: 22 South Carroll Street – Exterior Façade Improvements for “The Park Hotel”
 Located in the Downtown Core District. 4th Ald. Dist. (35998)

REFERRED:
REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

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

DATED: January 14, 2015 **ID NUMBER:**

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 14, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of exterior façade improvements for “The Park Hotel” located at 22 South Carroll Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Melissa Destree, representing the Mullins Group. Appearing in support and available to answer questions were Tyler Smith, Brad Mullins, Susan Springman and Jason Ekstrom, all representing the Mullins Group. Appearing neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak was Nan Fey. Based on the Commission’s previous review and comment on the project, Destree looked at the cornice details and banding, evaluating the 3rd floor railing stylistically, unifying the Main Street and Carroll Street façades with a 2-story element, breaking down the mass of the 3-story wall around the parking, the option of hard awnings, and using soft awnings to delineate the minor areas (retail portions). Starting on the Main Street façade they have a black granite base creating the line on the sidewalk, one more window has been added to the top for alignment, vertical stone to break up and bring height to the massing, the creation of a reveal at the curving element featuring one of the suites on the corner, a metal band emphasizing the horizontality of with the windows. As you come around the façade they have new screening for the parking lot, an additional column to break up that area, with 6-8-foot high screening to break up the brick façade. Destree ran through the proposed building materials. The schedule calls for construction to begin in October 2015 through June 2016; 50 rooms will be open and available throughout the construction period.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Is there a change in plane between the two colors of EIFS on the Carroll Street façade?
 - Yes, 1-½”. There will be a nice shadow line.
- On the Main Street elevation, what is this?
 - That is the exhaust for the hood, it’s an existing opening. We added one little window, so currently there’s two windows, we’re pulling 6-feet of the brick back and there’s an existing 20-foot hood there on the interior for the commercial kitchen.

- You've done a really nice job of detailing the building in an Art Deco tradition, but I don't think that the Art Deco style, decoration on top of the base of the building is appropriate for a building that never saw that era.
 - It's not intended to be Art Deco. It's very similar to many of the structures on the Capitol where we're using granite and limestone and traditional vertical recesses to reveal the details. We're trying to emphasize the verticality of a very flat structure. It's intended to be a thoughtfully detailed element that makes it feel traditional, but it's going to be very modern.
 - I concur, when you see the actual material sample and the closeness in color between the EIFS, some of that articulation is going to be lost and more of the façade will feel akin to its present condition, in my opinion. Although the windows will all be replaced.
 - You would like more contrast between the two?
 - I personally disagree with applying this false verticality on the building (EIFS above the three-story base). I question how successful it will be, coupled with how similar the colors are the lack in change of plane. I don't know that it will read successfully. I wouldn't take that approach.
 - This building here is from 1983, and we are retaining the EIFS and rejoining what is currently there, and then building up to add shadow lines and the metal reveal to fold together and weave the building, and it is compositionally horizontals and verticals weaving together. We're trying to tie together basically three structures. We've studied it 6 different ways and backwards and this kind of layering of horizontal and vertical has felt good to many eyes that have seen it.
 - On the 80s building where you have the lighter shade of EIFS, I didn't know if you have the same shade as on the other building, whether that would make that middle element read running rather than have the vertical element be your added pieces, if you had considered that.
 - We had more of a contract. We are actually tying in our EIFS banding much more similar to the color of the brick.
 - I just wondered whether the Carroll Street façade, if you had the EIFS the same color as the brick, just the central element, whether that might hold the center of the building with just the vertical being your added elements, not the color.
 - As we turn around the corner we also bring this white around to break up this huge wall. We were trying to hold that verticality because it's almost impossible to take this and make this horizontal.
 - You have the base and then the middle seems to be trying to grab up to the top by the color of the EIFS rather than be its own stand alone middle and I don't know whether the color gives you the verticality or the elements do.
 - I think this is a pretty complicated project and you've worked hard on it. Some of the changes have really addressed our comments. I'm not sure given the work that's gone into this, ultimately you've got a building that's completely unsuccessful in its current form. I see you're trying to tie into the feel of the Capitol Square as opposed to what this building is on its own.
 - Also the feel of the brand of the hotel, a traditional feel.
- With that said, this is one of those situations where we're never going to be completely happy.
- There's a lot of room for simplification of the stylistic details on the first 3 floors without impeding the function or the budget, but a more taut streamline composition would work to tie the building together, versus a façade that harkens back 70 or 80 years. There's a certain level of detail and texture that as you get down to the lower level just explodes and it's not consistent with the building in any era of its iteration.
 - Specifically I would simplify the line here, the balcony rails, the green and black granite, I would simplify the material palette and the lines. Try to bring a little bit of consistency with the amount of detail and materials that you have here with the complex texture. It's well done I just think it's a bit too much and inappropriate for a building that was born in the 60s.

- I would respectfully disagree. If you look at many of the structures on the Capitol Square, many of the more traditional urban buildings, the basic structure of the granite base, the vertical inset granite piers, if you look at 100 Wisconsin, 22 East Mifflin, there's a very natural modern look. It's very traditional materials but they're detailed in a very modern way. I'd urge you to look at this. These are not traditional because this is all stone that's actually hung on the façade. It is a modern interpretation of a traditional style of a column and it was specifically the desire of the owner to have something rich and textural that really ties together with the human experience on those first 3 stories. It might not be the minimalist approach to architecture but I think it's a well done approach to the detail and style.
- I thought there was more integrity to the existing "thing" I could understand the reluctance to such a dramatic change, but I don't think there's a lot of integrity there. Certainly this kind of sense of what buildings on the Square, I think Melissa is correct in that there are a number of buildings that have this kind of thing. Would all of choose those, probably not. It's not a building that's beginning, it's a remodel.
 - It also has kind of a residential scale, so the whole concept towards doing this design is less of a corporate feel and it actually had a little bit more detail and more like a residence.
- I'm seeing different levels of attention to different parts of the building. Bring the simplicity down.
 - We do have a challenge in materiality with the Zoning Code. So we're maintaining the EIFS with repair. Every decision we made was meant to be very thoughtful while keeping the aesthetic in mind.
- For the Commission the question is, is the design approval versus is it necessarily all of our preferences?
- I do not think that the materials and change in plane are going to successfully recreate the verticality that you're striving to gain in the renderings. There's not enough contrast between the upright pieces and the horizontal pieces. If your approach is to create these vertical bays, you may want to study either your color palette, that it may look more like the existing façade, which doesn't really have a dominant horizontality or verticality.
 - I can say with strong confidence that what we are showing would look like this or be flat.
- You'll have an 1-1/2" change in plane between a white and a cream.
 - Yes.
- If we refer this to our next meeting is it possible that that still works for your timetable and you can have some revisions back that we can weigh at that time?
 - If the only areas of work need to be identifying the contrast of these 2 colors, and then removing detail from the pedestrian façade? You want to have us remove detail from the façade of the building, do you need it by next Wednesday?
- (Staff) The deadline is next Wednesday for the following meeting on the 28th.
- The other issue is the color above the 3rd floor plane, the change in plane.
- The solution of how you're trying to get the verticality, and there's uncertainty if the present design does that. Maybe you can provide something that more convinces that, or provide an alternative, I'm not sure what your solution is, but that seems to be the sticking issue.
- The approach which appears to be a traditional application to the building is an approach that I personally wouldn't vote to support. The comments I'm making today are trying to help you or talk to you about the approach that I understand you're taking, so that it would be successful but I won't vote in support of this with minor iterations, just to make that clear.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Huggins, seconded by Harrington to grant initial approval failed on a vote of (2-3) with Huggins and Harrington voting yes; and Slayton, Goodhart and O'Kroley voting no.

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by O'Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** this item to take into consideration options to simplify the building. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0). The motion provided for the applicant to look at the application of materials from the 3rd floor up because the extreme similarity in color and the lack of plane change that won't quite potentially result in an elevation that's flatter and more similar to the existing than the rendering leads to, in addition to the simplification of the architectural detailing on the three-story base of the building.

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: 22 South Carroll Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	4	-	7	-	-	7	4

General Comments:

- 1930's Art Deco decoration detracts from design.