



Agenda Item #:	6
Project Title:	1849 Wright Street - Exterior Renovations to an existing Public Building, Madison College North Building, Truax Campus
Legistar File ID #:	78776
Members Present:	Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Rafeeq Asad, Marsha Rummel, Wendy Von Below, Christian Harper and Russell Knudson
Prepared By:	Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of November 1, 2023, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of exterior renovations to the Madison College North Building, Truax Campus located at 1849 Wright Street. Registered and speaking in support were Drew Martin, and Fred Brechlin.

The applicant provided an overview of the project site, including location, context, and existing conditions. This is for the construction and remodeling program, so workshops. A roof plan shows the existing and proposed rooftop mechanicals. The material palette is inspired by the rest of the Truax Campus. The stone has been removed from this project, but the brick and metal panel are maintained. The scope is limited to the northwest portion of the building. The limestone pier was eliminated, as well as the size and consistency in the windows across the façade of the building, which helped balance the building.

The Commission had the following questions for staff and the development team:

- I don't know if this needs to be addressed at this point, but seeing as we were just talking about trees and tree islands, I noticed that there is no indication of what is going in the proposed islands. Is that something that is yet to be designed and come forward?
 - My understanding is that since we are not adding to the building we have triggered no landscape requirements for the project.
- Could you talk about the large construction yard that is shown on the site plan, the fence details and the aesthetics, or lack thereof?
 - The location of the yard is a Zoning item and it will need to be relocated to the south of existing the building rather than where is it shown. The fence will be poly coated chain link fence, and further screening would be banners consistent with other banners on the campus, consistent with other fences/banners on the campus.
- Banners and coated are a plus.
- This is a really open space and it seems like plantings needs to happen, also the 15 stalls in a row. To me it looks like the parking lot is changing, why wouldn't we need a tree island in that expanse?
 - There are no islands in the parking lot currently, all those islands are new.
- (Secretary) You're adding all those islands?
 - Yes.
- (Secretary) Then those islands that are being added are certainly on the table for discussion with regard to plantings. We do need to think about the rational nexus between the improvements and the requirements, but improvements they are doing certainly need to meet Zoning Code requirements. We need to start thinking about how things become more compliant with the code as things move forward.

- I don't want to penalize you for doing a good thing, but I would love to see trees in the tree islands, I would leave it to a staff level whether it needs to conform to the every 12 stall break-up of the parking.
- As we look at the front entry, left and right of the stair ramp sequence you have some void space, wondering if that is a good opportunity to break up the hardscape with softscape. Nothing complicated, but something to benefit the design by having some plant massing along the base where the windows are up high. Is there any reason, utilities or otherwise why you couldn't plan those two small pockets.
 - Other than they're currently hardscape no, it's not a deal-breaker.
- (Secretary) To clarify, technically on public buildings we're approving on the building and advisory on the landscaping.
- I would advise that then.
- Staff requested we look at the materials, you have limited it to the utility brick and metal panel. How do the materials propose to meet the ground plane – are you bringing the metal panel down to touch the ground?
 - The existing foundation wall is currently above grade and those will remain, the metal panel will come down to the foundation wall. On the far side, this is the only place where the metal panel comes down, everywhere else it is brick coming down, but where the metal panel does come down it will terminate 8-12" above grade with exposed concrete foundation.
- Is this whole building part of the scope?
 - No, just the colored portion. From this wall on is our scope, this wing wall this way is existing. At one time we were looking at more, but as part of our scope we start at this wing wall.
- So, the scope was reduced since the Informational Presentation?
 - Yes. That was a hopeful bid scenario.
- So, the stair tower is existing?
 - Yes.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Does it make sense to not bring the metal panel down to the canopy on the main entry? There are some datums that could be simplified. The canopy level is touching the head of the window, but then I don't know that the band works above it as successfully as it did at Informational. Those materials are basically the same colors.
- There is something nice about the diagonal supports for the canopy mounting into the masonry versus going into the metal panel.
- It looks a little odd to me.
- I agree, I do like the attachment in the metal brick, it gives a base and top. There's really no base-middle, we have a very strong base with no middle and just a top, and we're counting the base, really becomes stairway and residual foundation wall that isn't rendered in every condition. It is a little deceiving on proportions. It's just shown as though that ugly 8-12" of foundation isn't there, when it is.
- It is a one-story metal building, so we talk about our classical features of base middle and top of building that is really squat. I hate for it to get busy with a lot of different expressions. Your base really is your gray wall.
- I agree, I just wanted to point out that the renderings are not showing it accurately.
- Looking at the rendering, the thick masonry wall next to the stairs, is that habitable space, is there a door there?
 - It is a bollard.

A motion was made by Asad, seconded by Knudson for Final Approval.

Discussion on the motion:

- Would you be amenable to adding a condition on the poly coated chain link fence and banners?
- I'm not sure if we're able to make recommendations on the fence?

- (Secretary) That keeps the future fence discussion in the future administrative. As a Zoning condition of approval when this goes to Plan Commission, that construction yard will have to be moved to the south side of the building. It would make sense to make that condition now regardless of the location.
- I like the comments on softscape on the corners there. A final nice thought.
- Can staff please clarify the code requirements related to tree islands and landscaping?
- (Secretary) Because their improvements are limited to the islands there, those will have to be code compliant. I think it requires 70% of the island to have foliage. Based on the level of change happening on the site, they aren't adding 10% floor area or doing a redesign of the surface parking lot, they aren't triggering full compliance with code. We are limited to the improvements they are making and those will have to meet code.
- So we don't need to add it, it's built in?
- (Secretary) Yes.

Action

On a motion by Asad, seconded by Knudson, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion passed with the following advisory recommendations:

- The chain link fence shall be powder coated and include banners for screening.
- That landscaping be added to the foundation of the building along the front elevation in-lieu of existing hardscape.

The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0).