

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: April 22, 2015
TITLE: 1701 Wright Street – Madison College Culinary Addition and Renovation (Public Building). 12 th Ald. Dist. (36183)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: William A. Fruhling, Acting Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: April 22, 2015	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Melissa Huggins*, Tom DeChant, Cliff Goodhart and John Harrington.

Huggins recused herself on this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 22, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of an addition and renovation to the Madison College Culinary building located at 1701 Wright Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Hamid Noughani, representing Madison College; Justin Frahm, representing JSD Professional Services, Inc.; and Fred Brerkin. The façade of the new addition will mimic what was done previously on the Anderson Street façade with the material and geometry. The proposed addition has displaced largely the entire plaza area between the two buildings and created a strong geometry with the building expansion as it relates to the site. They are now utilizing larger canopy trees in the parking areas. The design guidelines of Madison College call for a new type of façade and architecture around the perimeter of the building, with this theme continuing in future development. The existing administration building will be re-veneered with limestone and the roof will be replaced.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- There is an integrity to the original architecture, which doesn’t relate well to this addition. It relates more to the changes made on the other side of the building, where the façade was completely re-done and related to the new buildings that were going up across the street from it.
- At the prior meeting, there was discussion about integrating some limestone to try to bring some of that element into the addition. This looks like you’re completely turning your back on the design and materials of the existing building.
- It is hard for the Commission to see this addition in isolation from the design guidelines, so it would be very helpful for the College to come and present those design guidelines. Perhaps maybe some general timeline of how the building will be re-clad in limestone would be helpful. Maybe show that the master plan is changing the complete skin of the building, if that is what you intend to do. These two (buildings) are not relating to each other at this point.

- The building as it stands on this façade has an integrity with the use of materials and how expressions were made with openings. There was a strong original design intent and execution in that façade that goes along Anderson Street. You could possibly do the curve, but if you were doing it in similar materials it might relate better than if you were switching materials as well as changing some of the architectural expressions. Instead you're changing both the materials and the expressions and you still have the rest of this building to relate to.
- The re-cladding of the administration building, at this point with what's present and assuming some red brick will remain for some time, does not seem appropriate. The administration building being the same or similar material to the existing campus creates a balance with this new entry addition that you're providing. So when they were the same material there was a bit more balance and a bit more integrity with the existing.
- Work with what you've got. There is a lot of red brick, assuming some of it will remain, you can insert an entry addition into that dialogue without trying to mask it in sandstone.
- The alternative approach would be to come forth with your overall plan and say this is what we're going to do and then it becomes public record and we can understand the public record. But to just bring forward this piece and say we think it's going to work, it's a little hard to visualize.
- We've emphasized the strong horizontal lines of the existing building, they are dominant and this proposed façade has a lot of vertical elements.
- The discussion focused on two alternatives: either work within the idiom that's going to remain for the foreseeable future, or if the College feels strongly that this is a total change, then that becomes part of the public discussion about this design. Either one is a choice that can be made.
- There should be large shade trees in the parking lot, and replace trees that were taken down or died. Perhaps go with Elms. The Barberry is a trash collector, so consider something smaller.

ACTION:

A motion was made by Goodhart, seconded by Slayton, to **GRANT INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion **FAILED** on a vote of (2-3-1) with Huggins recused, Goodhart and Slayton voting yes, and O'Kroley, DeChant and Harrington voting no.

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (3-2-1) with Huggins recused, O'Kroley, DeChant and Harrington voting yes, and Goodhart and Slayton voting no.

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 and 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1701 Wright Street

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

General Comments:

- Request integration of materials and forms from existing building.