

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 7, 2012
TITLE: 1440 Monroe Street – PUD(GDP-SIP), UW-Madison Student Athlete Performance Center. 5 th Ald. Dist. (25171)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: March 7, 2012	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, Melissa Huggins, and Henry Lufler, Jr.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 7, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GARNTEED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1440 Monroe Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Gary Brown, Nathan Novak, William Ketcham, all representing the UW-Madison; and John Schlaefer. Appearing in support and available to answer questions were Joe Dettlaff, Brian Peterson, representing Smithgroup JJR; Tim Lorre, representing UW Athletics; and Ann Hayes, representing the UW-Madison. Appearing neither in support nor opposition was Ald. Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, District 5. Appearing and speaking in opposition was James Yacky. Brown reviewed the Commission’s concerns from their previous review of the project, including the viewshed from Dayton Street through the arch, the viewshed along the central plaza space north of the stadium, the McClain Center north wall, the arches on the north façade of the new stadium. Brown noted that the project has been presented to the Joint West Campus Area Committee, the neighborhoods and representatives from campus on the west side and the University, they did approve the project and recommended approval to the Plan Commission. Concerns with light and noise have been addressed with the neighborhood and Alder. The updated site plan enhances the pavement and overall feel. Constraints include the need fire access as well as service along the south side of Engineering Hall. Novak presented views through the Lot 17 greenspace and plaza looking south toward the Link Building, and looking north toward the Engineering Building. The paving pattern for Breese Terrace is a simple gray concrete with an exposed aggregate and sand blasting on the band to create a very subtle contrast. Ketchum touched on re-roofing the McClain Center, the creation of spaces along there and to create a safe connection from Badger Way through the site from the Camp Randall arch, through the Stadium and ultimately to Breese Terrace. There is a significant amount of snowfall and icfall that dumps onto Badger Way; one of the tasks they were given was to redevelop this façade as part of the re-roofing of McClain to begin to make this a safe environment and maintain connection through the site. They are limited by a number of things structurally in the building and the reality of resisting the snowfall. About 60% of the roof is freefall; they looked at putting fences on the roof, now barriers but were unable to make that work structurally given the delicate nature of the trusses inside the building. They began fenestrating the building in a respectful way to the modulation of the building that was existing. The new metal material is taken down to the ground in the overflow section to tie it together. They have developed a gutter to the smallest size possible with snow melting in there to be sure this wall has the capacity to get the snow melted and off the pathway. A new entrance has been created in much the same location as the existing McClain entrance to celebrate the student athlete and

give them a place to arrive. They now have a safe situation on the path, a masonry façade that relates all the way through the end of McClain to the end of the retaining structure at Breese Terrace, created a greenspace that didn't exist before, and an opportunity to move student academics up to the public space and occupy what is currently occupied by the structure of the scoreboard, which will house the new academic portion of student athletics. The windows will be both spandrel and vision glass, with a grade change being mitigated through the arch structure. Light fixtures will be downlighting with cut off so they do not produce glare, and rather than lighting the face of the building they will light the ground of the building and a bit under the building to make it a safe environment.

John Schlaefter spoke as president of the Regent Neighborhood Association. The RNA has not yet taken a position on this yet. He favors this and feels the University has done a good job of using design to address the neighborhood concerns, such as mechanicals on the east side facing campus rather than the neighborhood, the glass on the north section is tinted to it reduces the amount of light spilling out, and the scoreboard will have speakers on the side, facing in and down so that will reduce the amount of sound that goes into the neighborhood.

James Yacky spoke in opposition as a neighbor, primarily to the construction itself rather than the design elements. He provided a graphic to put some context as to what the neighborhood has put up with in regards to recent projects. The document shows the number of construction jobs the University has undertaken and how long those construction jobs have taken. In essence, this neighborhood has been subjected to continuous construction for over a decade. He likened it to running a dozen diesel generators running continuously for ten years. He put forth a plea for some sanity and quiet; he would especially like to see no weekend construction. This is a multi-year project that is on the heels of multi-year projects and he feels he lives in an industrial zone but pays significant taxes in a residential neighborhood.

Ald. Bidar-Sielaff mentioned some items that are important to the neighborhood. Firstly, the back of the scoreboard will remain the same as a clean billboard looking back to the neighborhood. The other issue has been the entrance being as far from Breese Terrace as possible and that seems to be the case. Lighting has also been a big issue, making sure that both the indoor and outdoor lighting doesn't produce too much light pollution into the neighborhood. The neighborhood likes the lighting on the Engineering Building and they want to be sure there is as little impact as possible. They want to see specific moped parking so that the pedestrian-bicycle corridor is safe and not cluttered with mopeds.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The previous speaker talked about weekend construction, any thoughts about that?
 - Construction timing and noise has been discussed and will continue to be discussed at it moves towards the Plan Commission.
- I'd like you to look at different options of what you could do in that arch and make sure you're content with whether it's a more natural feel or more formal going right to the arch.
 - I'm a little nervous about taking that to the Veteran's Group. They want something more natural in keeping with the park as you see it today.

What you have now is somewhat casual but it works because it's creating that background. Something more formal would be a specimen tree on axis.

- I don't think the bands in the walkway are going to be as impactful as they are in the drawings.
 - The idea was to break down the mass with concrete and give some texture to the walking surface.

Just make sure it's the intensity that you need it to be to do that.

- I like the changes, but in looking through the arch I would pull off what you've got at Camp Randall. Just take big Elm or Oak trees and carry that down there.
 - The idea was to have a large specimen tree with an evergreen backdrop of some sort.
- I appreciated the previous comments about the north wrap of architecture and I didn't see any alternatives or anything more firm in terms of that.
- Regarding the north shroud for how the plane is being handled, it seems to me there have to be other ways to deal with it. I understand you've got the conduit pipe there but you could look at changing the elevation, you could build over it, that parapet is extremely tall, you're building a whole new structure for that wall, why can't that be lower? This is a dynamic building and perceived from really two sides now and what makes it special is going to be hidden and I find that unfortunate that this is the solution.
- If the protection from the snow has to happen against that base the width of those pieces should be studied to be refined back from those ribs so that the ribs can still be seen coming down and the wall is just a bit narrower, if in fact that's the solution. And that's an opportunity for some daylight down below.
- Programmatically this project is fantastic. The way you've found back of house space and are now enlivening it with program space is fantastic. My only comments have been architectural in terms of the articulation.
- Is there any possibility of having this as a winter addition that comes off?
 - It needs to remain there the whole year. It's very much an engineering solution that we tried to make as good looking and acceptable as we could. The thickness of the wall is dependent on how much snow it has to hold.
- Where the existing concrete piers exist and the red huts come up vertically, they're pulled away from the ribs to give the ribs a bit more breathing room.
 - The reality of the structure is that the top of the buttress is engaged, this horizontal beam is doing all the work to help resist that overturning. When we tried to notch back between we got into a structural discontinuity and it just didn't work. We could come in on a casual basis and present the 17 alternatives to this that we presented DSF and DRB and tell the story of how we got there if that is helpful to you.

Barnett noted that he could not support due to a problem with the north shroud. He noted that there has to be another alternative that doesn't compromise the building (McClain Center).

ACTION:

On a motion by Lufler, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-3) with Barnett, Rummel 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, 6, 6, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1440 Monroe Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	6	6	-	-	6	6	6
	6	7	-	-	-	6	-	6
	7	7	7	7	-	8	8	7
	7	3	7	7	-	7	6	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	6	-	-	-	7	-	6

General Comments:

- Project is worthy other than ice shroud.