

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 26, 2008
TITLE: 333 West Washington Avenue – Amended PUD-SIP for a Hotel. 4 th Ald. Dist. (06876)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: March 26, 2008	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Marsha Rummel, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Bonnie Cosgrove and Jay Ferm.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 26, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of an Amended PUD-SIP for a hotel located at 333 West Washington Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Bill White, representing Lodge Works; Natalie Boch, representing The Alexander Company; Rosemary Lee, Jonathan Cooper, representing the Bassett District Capitol West Steering Committee, and Peter Ostlind. Attorney Bill White appeared and presented details of the revised plans as follows:

- A review of the building elevations emphasized modifications to the front façade where corrugated metal has been wrapped around the corners of the center projection to provide framing.
- A review of samples of the concrete block material provides that it will be a mixture of 70% gray stone, 15% spice and 15% ash charcoal cement masonry units, with a dark gray mortar to add variety.
- Precast concrete at the base of the building will be sandblasted to expose its aggregate surface with enhanced jointing details.
- The incorporation of windows on the building's rear or south elevation will require redesign of rooms where views are indeterminate with no major sight lines due to the building's proximity to existing and proposed structures.

Following the presentation Jonathan Cooper noted his appreciation for the mix and block as the right direction, where Peter Ostlind, speaking for himself maintained the issue with the use of block as well as his desire that the project utilize a better material, something as an alternative to the masonry as proposed. He felt that the use of block had already been overdone with adjacent existing projects within the area, as well as downtown and need to see something different. Rosemary Lee spoke in favor; impressed with the latest version of the project. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Still a problem with the façade, know we can get better, although comments on fenestration, pattern and scale provided; nothing has changed enough, architecture not there yet.
- Agree architecture not substantially better, don't want to delay the project, team can do better job. Maybe project should be presented in context with other buildings in the project area.

- The “wrap” on the front façade is OK but needs something that goes beyond, being OK needs to be exciting.
- Windows don’t wrap above canopy level, details not thought out yet.
- Fenestration pattern and scale of window treatment seem plain, no depth and scale. Need to accentuate verticality of the building.
- No layers of details in window detailing and fenestration or detailing in patterning of brick, no details in railing or portico as well as lighting under portico with no level of detailing provided for functions at the street level.
- The continued use of spandrel panels still an issue.
- The front façade is under-detailed at the ground plane with upper elevational detailing needing more to work architecturally.
- OK with the rustification of concrete and patterning but front façade treatment is the issue.
- No problem with handling of west end front elevation but question as to why the east end of the front elevation is not handled in a similar appropriate manner.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Ferm, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1). With Slayton voting no. The motion to refer required address of the above stated requirements relevant to issues with the front elevation requiring address, especially the ground level view where the first two levels should have a higher level of scale than upper levels with appropriate context provided with levels of scale being more architecturally addressed on the front façade.

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, 6, 6 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 333 West Washington Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	6	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	7	-	-	-	-	7	7
	-	3.5	-	-	-	-	5	4.5

General Comments:

- Little progress on façade. Because public granted right-of-way to project, it’s incumbent to deliver a superior street experience of building.
- Needs to be very good or better for this important site.
- Not there yet.
- Nearly all issues have been solved. Front façade/windows still need work and thought.
- This design team can do better with the front of the building. Today’s version shows too little change, too little improvement from the previous.