

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: May 2, 2012
TITLE: 1650 Pankratz Street – New Construction, Campus Facility for Lakeland College in UDD No. 4. 12 th Ald. Dist. (25972)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: William A. Fruhling, Acting Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: May 2, 2012	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 2, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of new construction located at 1650 Pankratz Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Zach Voelz, representing Lakeland College; Scott Pulver, representing Sullivan Design Build; and Marty Rifken. Rifken presented the context of the project. Pulver then presented drawings showing a second cupola, giving the building the same look from Pankratz Street and Packers Avenue. To break the long horizontal building, end split face piers have been raised to the elevation of the roofline at the ends of the building all the way around. In conjunction with that, the EIFS panel above the window system has been pulled out to sit on top of the piers at each of the four locations to give some relief in the horizontal façade at the ends of the building on all four sides. That same rhythm has been introduced onto the side elevations for vertical separation in the horizontal façade. The brick color has been changed to be lighter to give more contrast with the split face block.

The Commission’s discussion included the following comments:

- Nice job in bringing the building into balance. It makes it kind of playful from the street.
- The elevation facing Packers Avenue has Viburnum, lilac, columnar Arborvitae and grasses. A minimalist look is OK, but all these little pieces are not going to be seen very well. Something that has a bit more substance, like Evergreen, would make more of an impact.
- The landscaping in front of the building is fine, but you could almost go with a hedge that would be a nice green line at the base of the building. Also, the crabapples will block the view of your building rather than frame the building.
- The plantings around the building ignore the architecture. Its plantings don’t pay attention to how the building moves in and out – consider clusters in some areas.
- Don’t use stone in the parking islands. The Zoning Code may require vegetative ground cover. The changing of materials from masonry to EIFS in relatively close to the same plane may be working against the idea of sensing this strong form. Maybe it’s how that material is treated if it’s part of the cupola rather than the side walls (masonry). We talked about this big center form in the building.

You've done that successfully in height and elevation, your eye goes to the center. But then when you see it in perspective you realize it's cheating you a bit because you turn from masonry to EIFS. Now that we understand it's not one central form, consider a different color for the EIFS.

- The way this landscape is done makes the building feel like it's sitting by itself and doesn't engage its site. There are slight curves that could be straight lines or go against it to make it stronger with bigger, exaggerated curves. This small scale stuff doesn't work.
- The original cupola sits separately from the brick on the lower base and it kind of floats within it. The EIFS actually steps back a bit so this element is out beyond the wall of the parapet.

ACTION:

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Lufler, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with Rummel and Barrett voting no. The motion provided that the landscape comments be returned to staff for final approval. The motion provided for the following conditions to be approved by staff:

- Resolve the design conflict between the top of the entry portal, cupola and screen wall.
- Revise the landscape plan to address the concerns described above.

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 4, 5, 5, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1650 Pankratz Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	5	4	-	-	-	5	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	3	4	5	-	6	6	4
	6	5	5	-	-	6	6	6

General Comments:

- Applicant should consider a single cupola form extending from the entry and extending over vending alcove. One form would be stronger. Only the window openings of the lounge, not the floor plan, would require study. Study the strong forms of the proposed adjacent buildings.
- Almost soup, strong elements could be enhanced. Landscape should interact with architecture. Should have gotten initial, not final.
- Architecture is not there.
- Landscape needs to relate to architecture. What happened to our requirement for readable plant lists?!