

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: May 9, 2018

TITLE: 211 North Carroll Street/200-220
Wisconsin Avenue – Redevelopment of the
MATC Building into a Hotel in the
Downtown Core District. 4th Ald. Dist.
(51390)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: May 9, 2018

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Dawn O’Kroley, Cliff Goodhart, John Harrington, Christian Harper and Tom DeChant.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 9, 2018, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for the redevelopment of the MATC Building into a hotel in the Downtown Core District located at 211 North Carroll Street/200-220 Wisconsin Avenue. Registered in support of the project were Larry Westrich, Jim Webb, Dave Alberson and Justin Davidson, all representing Drury Southwest; Shane Bernau, representing SmithGroup JJR; Kevin Whitfield and Charles Quagliana. The team reviewed existing site conditions, keeping the existing terrace and trees along Wisconsin Avenue while replacing the sidewalk. All new trees would be planted along Johnson Street where a café space is proposed on the corner. The team identified program elements and circulation by floor level, material details and colors. They will continue the MATC building stone at the base. The window sizing and rhythms will not copy the historic but be similar in style. The parking garage would be enclosed with windows in clear glass that will block the view of cars from the outside. The parapets will screen the mechanical equipment. The team presented 3D model views from different angles, and an aerial view of the overall project showing its relationship and context with surrounding properties. It was noted that Traffic Engineering has issues with the pedestrian corridor on Dayton Street.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The East Johnson approach shows two driveways but only one car entrance.
 - One goes under grade, one goes above grade.
- You’re not trying to match the materials of the existing building. Have you considered keeping some of the datums? They’re so close that they should align, but they’re not.
 - On some elevations they line up, on others they don’t, that’s the complexity, on the existing MATC building the windows don’t align. We’re fighting the battle of consistency on the inside of the structure, versus viewpoints on the outside of the structure.
- That datum could drop a couple of inches for a cleaner elevation?

- Yes it could, it all comes together on the Wisconsin elevation. On that outside corner your windows aren't going to be matching, but your point is well noted. If we staggered the windows on one side but not the other, these would no longer align with these windows.
- It also goes along with the concept of seeing these as two separate projects, we're not trying to copy the original building but being sympathetic to some of its design elements.
- Are you compelled to keep the original arch? You're lowering it? You're trying to look like the MATC building but I wonder if it would be more successful with a more modern approach. When you try to mimic something that's so close to the original, it starts looking almost cartoonish. You're not really replicating and then by comparison, it's very suburban looking. It looks like something you would build in Middleton, it makes that even more pronounced and by attaching the arch to the building, I'd almost rather see it pulled away with a more modern expression. It's too suburban and too off, you should go the other direction.
 - The neighborhood wants to keep the arch but they didn't specify using it as an entry.
- I don't have a position yet on whether the arch should be attached or not, but I do have a sense that the façade is way too busy and doesn't quite succeed. I like the side facades, the datum is an issue we can talk about. Using the other arches as a reference doesn't do anything. These little extra bump-ups above your other entrances don't do anything either; I want that line to continue. The other building has simplicity of line and now you've complicated that.
- There's so many different lines.
- There are too many colors of brick. It's getting very busy, if you could simplify that brick color, bring that line so it's clean going across and matches some of the sensibility of the lines on the original building.
- I agree, it's not designed to this place. You could pick this up and put it anywhere, and this conversation is very similar to the hotel discussion we had right down the street, it was a very off-the-shelf, placeless design, here we are bringing it here. As you can see now the Edgewater design evolved quite a bit. This is interesting because MATC is a great big mass on that block, and I don't know that that's an outstanding attribute of that building. Although you tried breaking it down there's no dialogue about entrances, you have one-way traffic in two directions, there's almost a pinwheel of movement on this site rather than very solid and occupying the full block. Look at directionality. You have to study the setbacks of your neighboring properties. I'm not talking about looking at the 100 Block and noting they're built to the lot line. They have about 10% of their building built out to the lot line, you have to respect that setback on Wisconsin and give that street some more breathing room.
 - That's why we stayed within the existing footprint.
- You need to show us the context for the blocks on Wisconsin Avenue.
- That frame around the window is interesting, that's a very different architectural language, if you play up that frame around those windows.
- The parapets are way too suburban. I understand you need to screen the mechanicals but look at a different approach.
- This blank wall is highlighted by the fact that you're changing your brick color.
- That's probably your only Capitol View at that blank wall.
- On your entryway passage into the lobby, it starts out wide and then you constrict it, then opens up again. It doesn't even align with your entry. It ought to have the same space open to encourage pedestrian usage through there.
- The patios are rather small. If you want activity on the street those could conceivably be larger to encourage more restaurant use.
- As the buildings meet, look at how they meet. I'm not sure how the new building being projected from the old building has an appropriate dialogue with how those façades. Maybe a forward projection could work in another material but I don't know how brick-to-brick how that's respectful of the existing and

still exciting for the new. Check your slopes in terms of safety; if I'm driving upward and can't get level to get appropriate view for pedestrians...

- I want to strongly reiterate that immediately this felt too suburban. This is a very, very prominent location. There's a lot of distinguished architecture down here.
- I agree 100%. I do like the programming though. It's really more of the façade and appearance, it's not the functions or the mass. Before you guarantee that you'll have those trees there check with the Fire Department.
 - We've talked with Fire but need to continue the discussion with Forestry.
- What dictates the height of the parapets? You talk about projections that come up and don't go back. I don't see why those two planes can't be the same height, why is that height 2-3 feet higher than the other one?
- I'd lose the parapet right there.
 - There's a 5-foot difference there because the hotel portion is on the southern side of the parking garage which is 5-feet higher than the northern side. That doesn't discount your comments and we'll certainly look at it, but that's the simple answer as to why they aren't the same.
- It needs more urban context. If you lose the parapets going across the windows have more context. The sides of the buildings are relatively successful in terms of how they talk to each other.
- Study the datum. Some of the graphics make it look a lot more suburban.
- Block 89 is larger scale than this but much more broken down. Not that you should create some false sense of historic look, but you could break it into more masses.
 - You don't see a problem with the emphasis of horizontal?
- I would create more of a break between the two buildings. Let that existing building have a little breathing room. Is this a tax credit project?
 - Yes.
- I'd look at the National Register standards about appropriate construction to historic structures, how to appropriately meet these structures. And thank you for going for the tax credits.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.