

AGENDA # 10

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: May 23, 2007
TITLE: 8 Straubel Court – Public Project and Alteration to an Existing PRD. 17 th Ald. Dist. (06508)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: May 23, 2007	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Michael Barrett and Richard Slayton.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 23, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of alterations to an existing PRD located at 8 Straubel Court. Appearing on behalf of the project was Jim Glueck. The project provides for an addition to the East Madison Community Center which is located on then Truax Apartment Complex operated by the City of Madison Community Development Authority Housing Operations Unit. The new addition provides for the construction of a performance space and gym in combination with new handball courts on the westerly side of the existing community center. The performance space will be approximately 1.5 stories in height with the gymnasium facility 2.5 stories in height. The overall building façade treatment features the use of 4” face brick to match the existing Community Center including soldier course banding with EIFS utilized on upper portions with the addition. Glueck also emphasized the extensive community involvement around the design of the building addition. He also noted that additional parking was required as an extension of existing parking adjacent to the community center to serve the new addition as well as provide for fire access. He also emphasized the remainder of the site would be redeveloped in the future with a master-planning effort yet to be initiated. Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- There is an issue with a limited amount of windows relevant to the performance space portion of the addition and only on the four corners of the gym.
- The landscape point requirement seems to be under filled or just meets the code. Redo the landscape worksheet to indicate that requirements are satisfied with existing and proposed landscaping on the site.
- There is a disconnect between the building architecture and its skin relevant to windows to integrate the public realm with the interior in addition to the lack of landscaping.
- No information provided relevant to the lighting fixture cutsheets and fixture-type.

A general discussion followed relevant to the Commission’s ability to recommend modifications to the building façade as well as the immediate site adjacent to the addition based on the project’s progress and timetable not allowing for positive input as required from the commission. There was a general discomfort between the applicant and the Commission relevant to the Commission’s ability to provide constructive input on the project as required by ordinance based on the project’s immediate timetable for construction which lead to an impasse and provided grounds for the motion to refer.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0). The motion to refer was based on issues with the lack of receptivity by the applicant to potential recommended changes to the building addition's elevations, landscaping, and site plan relationships.

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 2, 3, 5, 5, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 8 Straubel Court

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	6	6	5	-	-	6	5	6
	5	5	4	-	-	5	-	5
	6	6	6	-	-	6	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	5	4	4	2	-	-	4	3

General Comments:

- Needs landscaping to normal UDC standards. Consider additional openness/windows, as this is a public building. It is very disturbing that the City deigns to ignore legal requirements that it enforces upon others.
- Opportunity for landscape at circle parking needs to be exploited.
- This project should have been brought to UDC in the design stage. Not after the project was bid.
- Relation to street.
- It's a community center – where are the windows?! Why does it wall itself off from the community?
- Integrate inside/outside.