



PREPARED FOR THE URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**Project Address:** 1849 Wright Street

**Application Type:** Exterior Renovations to an existing Public Building, Madison College North Building, Truax Campus  
**UDC is an Approving Body**

**Legistar File ID #:** [78776](#)

**Prepared By:** Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

## Background Information

**Applicant | Contact:** Drew Martin, Strang, Inc. | Fred Brechlin, Madison College

**Project Description:** The applicant is proposing exterior renovations to the North Building on the Madison College Campus that will be completed in phases. The proposed phase one renovations include interior reconfiguration of the entry sequence to create additional classroom and workshop space and re-cladding portions of the existing north and west building elevations consistent with the college’s material palette.

Future phases will include continued improvements to the building’s exterior on the remaining elevations, as well as improvements to parking area.

**Project Schedule:**

- The UDC received an Informational Presentation on July 26, 2023.

**Approval Standards:** The UDC is an **approving body** on the proposed building addition. Pursuant to MGO Section [33.24\(4\)\(d\)](#), “*The UDC shall approve plans for all buildings proposed to be built or expanded in the City by the State of Wisconsin, the University of Wisconsin, the City of Madison, Dane County, the Federal Government or any other local governmental entity which has the power to levy taxes on property located within the City.*” The approving authority of the UDC is limited to the buildings themselves. Comments related to landscaping would only be advisory in nature.

**Zoning Related Information:** While the project site is currently zoned Industrial Limited (IL), there is an active request to rezone the project site to Campus Institutional (CI). As noted on the site plan, there is a fenced area demarcated “construction yard.” This area is intended to be utilized as an outdoor classroom, including some outdoor storage. Pursuant to [MGO 29.097\(2\)\(d\)](#), in the Campus Institutional district, absent a Campus Master Plan, the establishment, improvements, or modification of any use occurring outside of a building shall require conditional use approval. In addition, in order for the “construction yard” to be consistent with the Zoning Code supplemental regulations pertaining to outdoor storage, the “construction yard” area will need to be relocated to an area outside of the front yard and not between the principle building and street. A viable location could be along the building’s south elevation in the side yard. Ultimately, the applicant is advised that the location of the “construction yard” area will require subsequent review and approval by the Zoning Administrator.

## Summary of Design Considerations

Staff recommends that the UDC provide feedback and findings on the development proposal related to the items noted below. As part of this review, staff recommends consideration be given to the following design related considerations as well as the UDC’s Informational Presentation comments:

- **Building Design and Composition.** Staff requests the Commission’s feedback and findings on the overall building design and composition as it relates to creating one cohesive architectural expression, especially where the proposed materials meets the existing materials and as it relates to proportions (top, middle, base), as well as architectural details/elements.

As noted by the Commission in their Informational Presentation comments, consideration should be given the reducing the scale of the masonry wing wall, and creating more uniformity with window openings across the façade.

- **Materials.** Based on the elevation drawings, the building material palette consists of aluminum metal panel and both stone and brick masonry materials. Staff notes that the materials board only indicates two materials, utility brick and metal panel. Staff requests the Commission’s feedback and findings on the building material palette, especially as it relates to material transitions and large expanses of a singular material (northwest elevation) and as it relates to the final materials selections and board. Staff recommends a condition of approval be included in the Commission’s action.
- **Site Amenities – Screening Fence.** As noted on the plans, an eight-foot chain-link fence is proposed around the “construction yard.” As noted above, the “construction yard” requires conditional use approval in addition to being relocated elsewhere on site. Staff requests UDC provide feedback and findings related to the fence, giving consideration to the proposed fence material and finish, opacity and effectiveness in providing adequate screening, and consistency and compatibility with the building materials and design, as well as context.

## Summary of UDC Informational Presentation Comments

As a reference, the Commission’s comments from the July 26, 2023, Informational Presentation are provided below.

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

- Did they move the construction program solely to Truax?
  - Yes.
- What’s the story on that exterior staircase? You don’t normally see an exposed two-story staircase like that.
  - This is existing, until future phases of the building remedy the existing exiting issues, that staircase does need to remain. The base scope of work starts at this corner and goes north. We have shown extending façade materials to the corner that would be contingent on the budget.
- What happens in the workshop that they have these large loading bays?
  - They build tiny homes and sheds as part of their construction program. The largest door allows tiny homes to be pulled into that workshop.
- Is that all transparent glazing on the roll up doors?
  - Yes.
- Is there any opportunity for skylights as a better method for natural lighting in the space instead of the doors?
  - We’re not currently anticipating any roofing work as part of our scope. It would be a consideration when it comes time to replace the roof on this building.

The Commission discussed the following:

- I think the limestone pier at the entrance is a little overstated for what this building is and could be reduced quite a bit while still being effective and holding the MATC brand.
- I share your concern about the large pier, have you studied other options to be able to brand that part of the building? I appreciate you looking at reuse of current window openings, but it leaves you with mismatched window proportions. Consider looking at something that would provide more uniformity across the façade with your window openings.