**AGENDA #** 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | | **PRESENTED:** February 1, 2012 | |
| TITLE: | 1440 Monroe Street – PUD(GDP-SIP), UW-Madison Student Athlete Performance Center. 5th Ald. Dist. (25171) | **REFERRED:** | |
| | | **REREFERRED:** | |
| | | **REPORTED BACK:** | |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary | | **ADOPTED:** | **POF:** |
| DATED: February 1, 2012 | | **ID NUMBER:** | |

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Dawn O'Kroley, Richard Slayton, Melissa Huggins, John Harrington and Henry Lufler.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of February 1, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 1440 Monroe Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Gary Brown and Michael Siegel, both representing the UW-Madison; and Nathan Novak, representing 1440 Monroe Street and the UW-Madison. Appearing in support and available to answer questions were Tim Wise and Ann Hayes, representing the UW-Madison. Appearing neither in support nor opposition was Brian Peterson, representing JJR. Brown presented plans for this three phase project which is already underway. Phase 1 includes interior remodeling of Camp Randall Stadium and replacement of the turf; Phase 2 is a remodeling of the McClain Athletic Facility practice facility including replacement of the roof and replacement of the north wall related to ice control and water runoff control; Phase 3 is the addition to the north end of Camp Randall for the student center and major renovations to the site work on the north end of Camp Randall and Lot 17. The project has been presented to the Joint West Area Campus Committee and the Regent Street Neighborhood Association.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Circulation is my biggest problem with what's there now.
- The scoreboard is an issue with the neighborhood as it faces outward and looks like a billboard.
    - The current scoreboard will be replaced with the goal of having it approximately the same size as what is there now. What you see in your graphics is a place holder that the graphics team was looking at. That is not what is going to be implemented with this project; unfortunately they kept it in their drawings. It'll be very similar to what is there now. We won't be adding any architectural lighting. There will be light in the building as it will be use until about 10:00 p.m. There will be some nighttime ambient light coming out of those windows and we're working on possible tinting, depending on energy requirements.

Nathan Novak from JJR then presented architectural details. The "wing" of McClain Athletic Facility Athletic Facility is coming off and being redeveloped as the main entry, giving it a main entry door that it does not have

today. Subtle improvements to the pavement of the pedestrian/bicycle path are planned through Badger Way. The configuration of the space near the arch is being considered. Lot 17 east is being turned into a campus green plaza. Seigel continued the presentation on the functional upgrade for the program to remain competitive. The McClain Athletic Facility Center has a problem with snow on the roof covering Badger Way. The new wall is a significant appearance enhancement as well as a significant safety improvement. The architecture of the Field House was studied and relates to the new arches proposed. Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- This is an awesome project that has somehow found this space. This piece is one architecturally that causes me concern in the choice to reference the Field House and the arch and the memorial arch; it overpowers that reference. In the articulation of the stone arch seems similar in proportion but the ground floor arch lessens that quality. There is an opportunity to have more depth in the façade with the first floor being open.
    - The views from the Link Building will provide the best views (Engineering Drive).
- Is this now a primary public entrance?
    - It's the major student entrance to the stadium.

  The form is lovely, it's just the articulation of the arches, I almost feel as though I would be entering into a major double height space.
- I appreciate and understand why the arch was chosen, but it doesn't seem like a real skin on the building. The architecture of the bleachers is pretty powerful, they speak to the strength of the buttresses. I think the skins of this new addition take away from the building and don't unify it. I'm more intrigued by contemporary architecture.
- I'm thrilled to see the upgrades to Badger Way.
- What concerns me the most is the McClain Athletic Facility Center proposal. The ice is a concern but this is a beautiful building and it was an award winner when it was constructed. The arches that come down are incredibly dynamic and then to create this parapet in an architectural manner that is in keeping with the building really compromises it.
    - It's purely about controlling the ice and snow. It's purely functional.

  This parapet covers up the whole thing.
- What if you move the walk further north and simply created a retaining wall and not hide this thing that I think is spectacular.
    - There are heating pipes for nitrogen and I can't move the whole sidewalk north. The pipes are in a concrete trench. I understand the significance of the architecture but we have to deal with the safety issues.

  Is there a way to create the parapet but break it; channel the snow so you can slice it and see those ribs?
    - There might be a way to articulate that face a little bit but I don't want to get too fussy.
- The ribs aren't the problem. Currently the building is articulated at the base, those shed areas are a breathing distance away from the ribs. If you needed an architectural solution on this face, if you retained that solution to the existing concrete on the site at those locations, that lets those ribs breathe a little bit more.
    - We just can't handle the snow load coming off of there.

  There's tons of motion that the architecture implies and this whole facility is about motion and activity; it kind of sings to what it is.
- Can you talk about any other options you explored?
    - Snow guards, snow fences (structural steel up from the trusses) to capture snow incrementally, we were advised that the truss didn't want to deal with that. We looked at taking the wall and cantilevering it up straight through. You could gamble and say I don't need that parapet as tall but if you really want to solve the problem and make it safe, we have designed this façade to respect the scale and rhythm of that existing building as it comes down to the ground.

- Look at the articulation and introduce a somewhat fussy proper patterning of the windows on this face of the building, which is industrial. The boathouse comes to mind, the roof and more modern use of masonry.
    - We're trying to break it down to a more pedestrian scale.

  I'd look at it on a bay-by-bay basis.

The treatment of the memorial arch, I would very strongly encourage you to treat the pavement differently at that location. Do something special at that area.

- We've done that on the east side already. The Camp Randall Memorial Park is actually a historic space. They've requested us to try to minimize what we're doing in this space. We're looking at it, I'm not how far we can go with the VA having some authority over that.

Think about it in terms of people going through.

- Is there some way to create a snow guard you put up on November and take down in April? In lieu of the way the parapet is designed could you create some kind of element that is removable so the architecture is preserved 8 months out of the year?
    - There are a couple of parking lots that have concrete pillars with salt in them. Structurally we have to pour that leg to support the weight of the snow and it's tied to the upper wall. To stand a temporary thing in there, I don't know what that would be.

  If there was some way to make that wall thick enough or profound enough, you can drill in tubing. Ask the engineering students!
- Look at precedents of arches around the world. There's not a lot you can do. It's a series of streets and alleyways amongst buildings. Where is slopes down, if that could look more like the lawn area. Detail on this will be important. I'd love to see what you would do if you just said, "let's make this exciting!" My biggest concern is making the arch what it can be.
- Somehow work that drive so that you have a reason to bend your view.
- The rhythm would be stronger if you could continue it along the edge with trees.

**ACTION:**

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission. Brown noted he would take the Commission's comments into consideration and return with modifications prior to a request for approval.

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, 5, 6 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR:** 1440 Monroe Street

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Member Ratings** | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| | 5 | 5 | 5 | - | - | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | - | 5.5 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 8 | 3 | 6 | 8 (for added greenspace) | - | 8 | 8 | 5 |
| | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 7 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Arches and snow guard solution need much work. McLain Centers architecture must be preserved.