

## AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** January 14, 2015

**TITLE:** 202 East Washington Avenue –  
Redevelopment of the “Pahl Tire” Site for  
a 10-Story, 146-150 Room “AC Hotel by  
Marriott” in UDD No. 4. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ald. Dist.  
(33109)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

**AUTHOR:** Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** January 14, 2015

**ID NUMBER:**

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of January 14, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for redevelopment of the “Pahl Tire” site for a 10-story “AC Hotel by Marriott” located at 202 East Washington Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Josh Wilcox, Andrew B. Inman, Jeff Lenz and A.J. Robitschek, representing The North Central Group. Appearing and speaking in opposition was William Gates. Appearing in opposition but not wishing to speak were Bob and Patty Wood. Appearing neither in support nor opposition and not wishing to speak were Anne Stoelting and Louise Smoczynski. They have significantly improved the arrival experience for the pedestrian and guest, and the pedestrian experience along Webster Street. They looked at their internal programming and made changes to create exceptional experiences for their guests as well as the public spaces. They feel the exterior design is exceptional and brings an iconic architectural piece to the city. The queuing of cars has changed for the valet station, which also resulted in more flexibility for the parking. The outdoor seating component has been pulled back closer to the building. The architecture is simplified in a “C” shape with a singular mass rising up with a 3-story element facing the residential property. The middle mass is now much more significant. The focus is now on the public amenities from the first floor and valet parking up through the 10<sup>th</sup> floor. Public art is also a large component of the project, which will be highly visible through the glass on this prominent corner. The ceiling on the 10<sup>th</sup> floor will also be adorned with art. Building materials still include metal banding, and utility brick, modular stone and glass.

William Gates spoke in opposition, citing traffic issues, massing and the Lamp House being affected.

Nan Fey spoke to the 10-story height on the entire footprint of the building. Webster Street is maximized at 6-stories to retain the residential character and feel of that block face, and while they are making efforts from a pedestrian point of view, 10-stories going up at that location does have significant impact on the amount of meaningful light that reaches the rooftop garden of the Lamp House, which was one of the clear goals of the Lamp House Block Plan. She encouraged the Commission and staff to look at that plan, and pay attention to Kevin Firchow’s staff report to the Plan Commission that goes through all the applicable standards, in addition

to her previous comments on the project. He concluded at the time that it was inconsistent with many, if not all, of the recommendations in the adopted plans. Given the lack of adjustment to the building height in this current proposal, she suggested that the Urban Design Commission could encourage that.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- One of the conditions of why this wasn't approved at the Plan Commission is the height. If this design or the previous design came back two stories shorter within the Zoning Code, I think you'd be ready for approval. At a minimum when you return I think you should come back two stories shorter.
- The center mass, if it were two stories shorter in height, does not deter from the architecture.
- The design is an improvement. I'm wondering whether the use of those masonry panels for the center section makes that seem heavy sitting on top of the glass.
- The 10-stories are needed financially, right?
  - Absolutely.
- The opposition beyond however exemplary your building is, that doesn't change the shadow issues and the Lamp House. To me that's the breadth of how you solve that. I think it's a great building and there will be shadows. I don't know if there's a way to look at the financial aspect of it and see if you can make it work. I think it looks beautiful here, if the Lamp House wasn't behind it we wouldn't have that issue. That's the big problem.
  - On the previous options we had a lot of ins and outs. Looking at it from a volume standpoint, the total deposit of volume from 1-6 and 6-10, and how much of that volume we're using on 15 Webster Street. We have significantly less volume there now. We are down one foot from where we were before.
- I think the height of the building is a hurdle you're going to have a harder time with at Plan Commission than here. As far as the building design I think it's a huge improvement because it's so much more unified and elegant, and simple all at the same time. I really appreciate you stepping back and rethinking it like this. I think having more activity up high can really be a contribution to the City.
- It's a beautiful building.

### **ACTION:**

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

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 rating for this project is 9.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 202 East Washington Avenue**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	7	9	-	8	8	7	10	9

General Comments:

- Design is simple and elegant. Much approved. Valet parking an improvement.
- Nice improvements but still too much mass. Still bicycle-car conflict. Shadow study tells us landmark is shaded from late fall through spring – no winter sun?