

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

**REPORT OF:** URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** August 16, 2017

**TITLE:** 130 East Gilman Street – PD, Conversion of the Former Governor’s Mansion/Executive Residence to an 8-Room Hotel with Event Space and Café. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ald. Dist. (47494)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Chris Wells, Acting Secretary      **ADOPTED:**      **POF:**

**DATED:** August 16, 2017      **ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Amanda Hall, Cliff Goodhart, Rafeeq Asad, Lois Braun-Oddo, Michael Rosenblum, John Harrington and Tom DeChant.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of August 16, 2017, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the conversion of the former Governor’s mansion/executive residence to an 8-room hotel with event space and café located at 130 East Gilman Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Robert Klebba and David Waugh. Klebba asked the Commission to weigh in on the appearance of the accessible walk on the southwest part of the building and how it joins up with the existing porch. He noted that protecting the sandstone foundation of the building from the berm they are building for the accessible walk is being worked on with their landscape contractors. He will also be working with Amy Scanlon, Preservation Planner and Jen Davel at the Wisconsin State Historical Society on how the retaining wall that will rise along that ramp and turn in along the southeast wall of the porch will meet with the concrete walk. In terms of how the parking layout interfaces with the building, there is concern about whether the front-most parking space is in the front plane of the building. There is sufficient space between the walk and the parking stall for landscaping. The loss of the Siberian Elm tree is not going to be significant to the property. The colors of the building will remain unchanged.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The stall being forward of the building – if that were designated as your accessible stall with the likelihood of that being open space, that would satisfy the need to not have a car forward of the property.
  - We lined up the accessible stall with the entrance to the ramp across.
- The aisle wouldn’t change, it’s just which stall is accessible. It might be open most of the time then.
  - That’s true, we could put the accessible stall at the front stall, yes.
- And keep your walk as you have it.
  - My question then is if that first stall were open and the second was the accessible stall, wouldn’t you want to have more space there, because you have five feet next to the accessible stall. You’re saying have those five feet in front, use that as an open space?
- Yes.

- My only concern is it looks like you'd have an easier time backing out from that second stall than the first one. It seems like too hard of a turn; I would think you'd want to give them more space to turn back.
- Has Traffic Engineering looked at this?
  - They do review this in the land use application. I've not seen a staff report from Traffic Engineering.
- I don't know if they're going to be OK with you backing into a 10-foot aisle.
- I agree with you. They like 20-foot drive aisles.
  - I did go to the DAT meeting and raise that issue. The response from Traffic Engineering is that there would have to be a variance.
- But you could try to argue the historic nature of the property to avoid excess paving.
- You've shown two retaining walls, what are the materials?
  - Sandstone colored concrete interlocking block.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by Goodhart, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0).