

## AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> July 21, 2010
TITLE: 1552 University Avenue – PUD(GDP-SIP) for Wisconsin Energy Institute New Laboratory Building. 5 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (16837)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: July 21, 2010	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of July 21, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) for the Wisconsin Energy Institute located at 1552 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Gary Brown, Alan Fish, Pete Heaslett and Abbie Moilien, all representing UW-Madison; Jim Moravec, representing the Wisconsin Department of State Facilities; Eric Lawson, representing the State of Wisconsin; Ald. Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, representing the 5<sup>th</sup> District; Patrick Gleason and John Schlaefer. Registered in opposition were JoAnne F. Kloppenburg, representing the Regent Neighborhood Association; and Ronnie Hess. Moilien presented revised details including:

- The building has been moved 10-feet to the east.
- 43 bike stalls are shown throughout the site versus the 16 previously.
- Moped parking has been increased.
- Planting areas have been extended to accentuate the main entry plaza to the building and provide more privacy for the café seating area.
- Granite pavers would be used to mark the main entry.
- The east entry will have a permeable granite paver patio.
- Bio-fuel demonstration areas will use prairie grasses.

Moravec detailed changes for the south elevation, including making the top appear different from the floors below it, addressing the major comments about the façade needing more dimension and having a greater sense of entry from Breese Terrace.

Public testimony was as follows:

- JoAnne Kloppenburg, representing the Regent Neighborhood Association felt that there could have been more of a dialog with the neighborhood. This building is a flagship for the University but it is also a gateway to the Regent Neighborhood. They continue to have concerns that the mass of the building is too big for the rest of the neighborhood. There is also continued concern with the height of the building as it relates to the intent of the neighborhood. There is also concern about the noise.

- Ronnie Hess also expressed concerns with mass and scale and the lack of communication with the neighborhood. She has real concern with the “smokestacks” coming from the building, that even though they will not be emitting smoke it is completely out of character with the neighborhood.

Ald. Shiva Bidar-Sielaff spoke to the importance of this gateway corner in our city and this neighborhood. In her opinion this building still does not transition between the end of the campus to the beginning of the Regent Neighborhood. She stated the noise and industrial appearance of this building do not reflect the feel of the neighborhood.

Discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- What is the big idea here, architecturally? Moravec and Heaslett noted:
  - The design reflects saving energy, first and foremost.
  - A space and place that inspires collaborative thinking and brings people together.
- How does your design respond to the neighboring buildings?
  - Heaslett: The building form recedes away from neighboring buildings.
- Appreciate your attempt to simplify the building, much improved.
- The color palette works well in framing the church.
- Don't have a problem with the building competing with the church.
- The pulling of the building form into the landscape strengthens your concept.
- Agree with the concept of having a taller building mass here; creates a better edge to neighborhood than Campus Drive.
- The height relationship is not respected on this side of the street (Old University).
- Halo not a strong enough gesture to relate to church, what can be done to top floor of atrium or light well in combination?
- Architecture doesn't portray vision of Wisconsin Energy Institute, section across from church needs tuning.
- Like building and mission with mass OK; need more work to reduce impression of façade with neighborhood.
- The south elevation doesn't read as a light well with two bays, it reads as four with light well as a bar. Make light well higher or its roof to read better as part of the south elevation.
- The face on old University is too vertical, it doesn't have a strong enough relationship to the church.
- Some of the proportions are starting to lead its way to a dialog with the church.
- The landscape is coming along pretty well.
- There is going to be concern about the second building with shading on Campus Drive.
- Provide more views coming from west and north, as well as details of the north elevation.
- Provide full plan details and elevations in the application packet.
- Think about noise masking for the neighborhood. In response Fish noted:
  - We are doing an ambient noise study from several different areas in the neighborhood.
  - In order for us to survive over the next 20 years we have to build as infill in neighborhoods.
  - We don't have a lot of lots and we do treasure our greenspace. We are trying to build courtyards and greenspaces around these.
  - This particular location was picked because there was no other spot that worked for the science that's going to happen there.
- I like this building and I really believe in the mission of it.
- I think the mass is OK. I find that the urban infill is a compelling argument. That's the compromise we have to make as a city.

- Agree that the extra height effectively creates a neighborhood wall. Stacks are OK, they speak to the purpose of the building.
- The light well idea doesn't come through on the south side. One idea would be to bring that light well higher so it communicates to the south side.
- The screening around the stacks adds a lot of height look at something different such as use of different color as the spire for the church is a different color.
- Small windows at stair on south elevation are not appealing and uncomfortable.
- Regarding the metal banding across walk; perpendicular application is not necessary.
- Make prairie bed different; it will require membrane.
- Consider moving more function above high bay addition, as well as on the light well elevation to relieve functions at Old University to provide a stepback.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Smith, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0-1) with Lufler abstaining. The motion provided for the following:

- Resolve issue with the mass at the office component at University Avenue with stepback to relate to the church, specifically the 5<sup>th</sup> floor with adjustments to the other features of the building.
- Look at maintaining noise reduction.

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, 6, 6, 7 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1552 University Avenue**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	6	6	6	-	-	5	6	6
	8	6	8	8	8	7	6	7
	6	3	6	-	-	6	5	5
	7	6	7	7	-	6	9	7
	6	-	-	-	-	-	7	6
	6	5	6	-	-	-	6	6
	8	7	8	-	-	-	-	6

General Comments:

- Has come a long way. Mass on University Avenue too tall; materials/colors coming along.
- Better, but still lacks a sense of scale, a bit too massive and blank feeling personality. Four floors on south office bar.
- Mass is OK. Energy = movement. This building is 4 slabs with picture windows. Simplify back to 2 slabs and light well!
- Dilemma – too much building for site in historic neighborhood and church.
- Nice use of tight space but south module (office) needs modification to relate more strongly to church.
- Study horizontal lines of Enzyme and introduce on Phase 1 for Phase 2 to continue dialog. Differentiation from historic neighborhood strong approach, further compatibility with historic proportions and scale.