

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: October 20, 2010
TITLE: 105 East Campus Mall – PUD(GDP-SIP) for a New Ice Arena. 4 th Ald. Dist. (16322)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: October 20, 2010	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 20, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) for a new ice arena located at 105 East Campus Mall. Appearing on behalf of the project were Gary Brown, Ann Hayes and John Chadima, representing the UW-Madison; and Lou Stippich, representing UW-FPM. Brown presented the plans for the UW’s new hockey/swim facilities. They are currently at 2,400 seats for women’s and men’s practice on the ice. Chadima presented site details for Lot 88, moving parking to a new parking area on the south and east sides of the SERF building. The building has two entries; one from East Campus Mall and one from the plaza of the Kohl Center. It’s a 3-sided ice rink and a place to tell the story of UW men’s and women’s hockey. On the west entry will be a bridge to the SERF building that provides access from the swim team locker rooms. They are trying to use the materials used in the Kohl Center with precast and metal panels. They are introducing two colors to give it more definition on this building, and color at the doors and panels next to the windows to bring the red back in. Additional work on the south side of the building adds metal panel and a “W” for more activity. Exterior light levels were discussed, as well as the levels inside the building. There will be underground locker rooms and coaches offices, showers and toilets beneath the plaza to connect to the Kohl Center. The main level is the primary public level with a concourse all the way around, inside the seating bowl. As you walk past you will be able to look into the facility. The second floor is primarily the swimming floor with a large lounge, men’s and women’s lockers, a small sports medicine facility, and across the bridge to the SERF building. The bridge is intended to be fairly simple; a steel structure spanning between the two buildings with translucent glass to allow light in. Graphics images within the glass have yet to be determined. Building material samples were reviewed.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- We had a lot of discussions about the parking area; can you say what has changed there?
 - The layout hasn’t changed over the last year; it’s been tweaked a little bit. The current Lot 88 has 55 spaces; we’ve accommodated here 47 spaces. The press has been moved into Lot 91. We’ve introduced a new stair and ramp so we can connect that accessible parking to both facilities.
- The west entry massing looks nice. The ridge piece – think about some areas of clear glass.
 - There are privacy issues. If we do any clear glass we’re going to want to limit that severely.
- Can you arrange that walk so it goes in between two cars instead of right into a parking stall?

- The issue is grades.
Either that or you need to put a walk along the edge. You need something there, it just doesn't make sense.
- The southwest façade feels bland to me, it feels like it got forgotten. Otherwise it's a nice facility.
- We really don't want more than 12 parking spaces without plantings. You've got to convince us, otherwise it sets a precedent for other applicants.
 - If it's not in the zoning ordinance, the official State response is "we don't have to follow it." We can recommend it as part of the PUD.
 Besides needing all the space you can get, can you tell us why?
 - We are trying to maintain that concrete, the only thing we're adding is this truck service access. We are doing some green along the south side of the SERF building to try and soften it.
- Little bit nervous about mimicking the material exactly from the Kohl Center, at least in the quantities. The southwest façade is what I remember most from the last time. Everything else is working just fine, but this is a little bit reminiscent of the massing of the Camp Randall addition; it's pretty blank. There has to be some kind of pattern or material, texture, windows or something more substantial than another "W."
- Will the motion "W" be lit during games?
 - We're not even looking at it to be lit. We're still talking about which way we would do that.
- Thoughts on introducing a little texture or color on the concrete floor? Maybe to help pick up on where traffic is going to go. I'm concerned with all the gray concrete of the building and the walks. I'm wondering if there's a way to get green along the edge.
 - We've got less than one foot with the fire lane.
- The main entry sequence is quite handsome.

ACTION:

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with Lufler, Barnett and Wagner abstaining. Harrington, Rummel, O'Kroley, Slayton, Huggins and Smith voted in favor; Lufler and Barnett abstained. Handy and Wagner non-voting with Wagner abstaining for the record. The motion provided for the following recommendations:

- Study the southwest façade to relieve its blank appearance.
- Look at the parking to help bring it up a little bit to provide for tree islands and relocate pedestrian walk outside of a parking stall.

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, 6.5, 7, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 105 East Campus Mall

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	6	5	-	-	5	6	5
	7	7	6	6	6	8	8	7
	5	6/4	5	6	6	5	8	6.5
	5	6	5	6	6	5	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7

General Comments:

- I likes me some gray precast....ZZZZZZZ.....
- Enliven loading dock side of ice arena – green up parking lot.
- Fine other than southwest façade.