

## AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

<b>REPORT OF:</b> URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> December 7, 2011	
<b>TITLE:</b> 723 State Street – PUD(GDP-SIP), St. Paul’s University Catholic Center. 8 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (20458)	<b>REFERRED:</b>	
	<b>REREFERRED:</b>	
	<b>REPORTED BACK:</b>	
<b>AUTHOR:</b> Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b>	<b>POF:</b>
<b>DATED:</b> December 7, 2011	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>	

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton and John Harrington.

\*Wagner recused himself; Barnett acted as Chair.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of December 7, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 723 State Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Ingrid McMasters, representing KJWW Engineering Consultants; Bob Krupa, and Ron Trachtenberg, representing St. Paul’s; Randall Milbrath, representing RDG Planning & Design; Robert Shipley, representing BWZ Architects; and Mark Landgraf. Appearing in support but not wishing to speak was Judy Karofsky. Trachtenberg stated the Landmarks Commission reviewed the project and found that the height, mass and design does not adversely affect the adjacent Pres House landmark. The Landmarks Commission did ask the UDC to look at some aspects of the façade element to see if they conflict with each other. Milbrath discussed the site plan, showing the intended street level entrance and vehicular access. Landscape studies have been included, which provide plantings at both street level and at the rooftop level with roof gardens on the upper level. Honey Locusts will replace the Birch outside the coffee space for durability, and additional plantings will be added. Fitch Court will have a rolled curb to provide some bike and moped parking, as well as access as requested by City staff. A total of 30 stalls for bikes or moped are available based on existing ratios for the zoning of this property. Permeable pavers will be placed around the planting areas. Much research went into the building materials in comparison to other church buildings around the country in a historical context. In particular, along the front façade, perhaps fewer windows were warranted. It allows for more ventilation and natural light for the staff and students that are using the building. As previously requested by the Commission, Milbrath detailed the interior of the multi-purpose room and the ceiling dome/roof structure.

Conceptual images were shown with views from Bascom Hill and the Capitol. Milbrath noted that St. Paul’s really doesn’t block that view corridor. The project as currently proposed has been scaled down in its scope and program as much as it can be. They have been consulting with the Pres House and discussing some of their needs. It is their intention to reduce the building by about three feet from their building (Pres House) to get a bit more air space, and go with a lighter color brick on the backside for light purposes. Bob Shipley discussed the material palette, including cut stone at the base (limestone), brick (Old School and Old Chicago) as something that is reticent of the landmark and historical aspect of the building; precast or glass fiber reinforced concrete in a buff range at the upper levels. A bronze type is proposed for the windows, medium anodized for doors. The

compromise is to use newer energy efficient windows with historical-based panning to get that deeper effect. Street and pedestrian level images were detailed. Floor plans have not substantially changed. More shadow studies have been done from more of an overhead view going through the seasons. Ingrid McMasters discussed the lighting plan in context with the facility's zero lot line. They have had discussions with City staff; the City is in favor of St. Paul's lighting beyond their property into the public way on the west side with LED fixtures for pedestrian scale. The south and east sides are the same; the north side facing State Street will receive more building lighting as well. From dusk until 11:00 p.m. will be maximum brightness, then until dawn operate at 50% and is fully dimmable. The cross at the very top is still under discussion as to the best way of illuminating it. Step lights are mounted on the outdoor terraces.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I really appreciated the inspiration pieces. It's too busy on the first ground plane compared to the simplicity of your neighbor.
  - We're going to look at what was talked about and recommend maybe taking columns down; it seems reasonable to look at and discuss. We want transparency at the ground level and we also have to have a certain number of doors, and the archway comes with the architectural style.
  - We wanted to make sure this shows the building as not just a church.
  - There is a code requirement to consider as to the number of doors.
- What about the entrance facing east, is the intent a cut out?
  - Yes. It's a very narrow alleyway and the City has a lot of underground utilities there. There is talk of making it more of a "European" walkway (woonerf).
- The idea of architectural precedent, in your references you can see they are lighter at the top. When you transfer the weight to the base is where you have the bulk. But in modern construction we know the brick is four inches thick the whole way up. On your side elevation, it's playing a trick with our minds in terms of historical style in the modern construction. The mass of the building would not come down on the weakest, most tenuous point. You're bearing on the spring-point of an arch, which is the lightest point. In term of tectonics those are the types of details that needs to be worked out.
  - Amy Scanlon of the Landmarks Commission brought up many of those same issues. We are looking at a heavier masonry structure. There will be tweaks and modifications made.
- What care have you given to the existing 1908 building that could be preserved?
  - It wasn't just façade that was removed, but literally inward was permanently changed and all the way to the basement. What's left of the original chapel is two side walls; there isn't much left to practically relate to.

I'm curious because what does remain of the 1908 façade seems to be what you're trying to emulate and maybe is worth preserving. Only two walls are left. What is left is being emulated with the building as currently exists and worthy of being preserved; use existing walls to respect history of structure; adaptive re-use.

  - There's a trade-off. Really all that's left of it is a wall, and somehow incorporating that into a 6 story building and still functions is difficult.

To me its respect to the historical aspect. There's fantastic quality materials that exist, and the description of the materials brought to the site essentially deteriorate as they go up.

  - There are some practicalities with the material choices as well. I'm just not certain how to incorporate that wall.
  - Unfortunately that wall is on Fitch Court which is not often used and is very narrow. Besides the architectural and construction issues it's a wall that may never be seen.
- I encourage you to stay with the plan you have for the rooftop gardens. I don't think it's appropriate to necessarily see the green roof from beyond the building but it's a great resource for the people looking out from the building.

- I would encourage the use of thornless Shade Master Imperial Gleditsia; studies have shown trees need 300 cubic feet to grow and thrive in an urban setting.
- One thing I still have concern with is shading on the mall. Once a mall is shaded the mall sort of collapses. How much more are you adding to what shading was previously there?
  - What we saw is the height of St. Paul's as it exists now pretty much shades State Street. What we're adding in the bit of extra height is maybe creeping up the library building. Most of it is in shade now.

That mall is very critical to Madison and the sun is critical to the mall; provide shade studies with further review of the project.

  - Right now St. Paul's doesn't engage the mall at all. This plan allows for more light and more of a node in the mall.
- If I'm living in the Pres House what are my views of the building?
  - The top floor or two of Pres House will be affected beyond how it is affected now. That was part of our discussions with the board at the Pres House. We talked about stepping back and lighting the building. Per verbal agreement, that the scenario.
- Is it an issue with students throwing things?
  - There are windows but I don't think we're concerned with that. That's more from balconies. Neither group brought up that issue. It's a green roof but not a party room. We are also talking to the Pres House about renting several floors in their building to try to run a similar type program for residential housing.
  - UW is in favor, Pres House, State-Langdon, Capital Neighborhood, we've gotten basically thumbs up.
- The plan shows for an outdoor café to be up one step from the street, is that open to the public?
  - We haven't discussed that but it's not closed off.

My concern is the space is meant to invite people in to enjoy that space, the step makes it not open. Please look at that from a Code standpoint.
- I don't have any concern with precast pieces as long as they don't diminish the quality of materials all the way up the façade.
- Dark sky compliant?
  - Fixtures comply with Madison Ordinances but they are not dark sky compliant in the sense that they shoot upward to light the building.
- This facility is going to attract a lot more people. I think you really need to look hard at the number of bike parking stalls. Saying the site won't allow isn't going to work; you've got to balance the two together otherwise bike parking will be tied to every tree and sign post. Robbie Weber is a good resource, she's taken counts on the site.
- In terms of the site plan, one thing about the Pres House that has always bothered me is this back piece along the base of the east elevation at Fitch Court. The cantilever section is awkward; it's an unsuccessful part of the project. What you've got going on here is more so because you're missing the column. You're trying to be true to form but this relationship is a product of what you have going on so I don't think our focus should be this corner. Focus on garage corner design to deal with missing corner element and carry-over base treatment as found on other elevations.
- This is a really great package. Thank you very much.
- You're building a building that isn't letting in light. Little windows and big spaces just don't work. It seems like you're missing an opportunity.
- The parking in this area and design a problem; disconnects design found at the base of other elevations.
- Architecture at front center windows and cameo needs more work.
- Thank you for working with your neighbors.

- The ability you have programmatically with this building and bringing greenspace out to State Street are all great opportunities, but two pieces that were done right in the 60s were the respect for the 100 year history on the site by continuing some of that hand as built on that, and the use of natural daylight in the sanctuary. I would take those two pieces to see how we build and improve on that. You have an outstanding lighting designer so build off of that and study what's there now (to incorporate into project).
- Barnett reviewed the Landmarks Commission's comments on the project:
  - The proposal is not so large that it has an adverse effect on the historic character and integrity of adjacent landmarks.
  - Staff is concerned that the application numerous unresolved traditional and contemporary architectural styles creates a complexity and overly detailed design that could be considered visually intrusive. Pursue a unified architectural expression for the building.
 Staff noted that Amy Scanlon, Preservation Planer noted that there are at least five different type of architecture on the building; there's too much going on. The lack of verticals to the ground is an issue, especially at the front. Those comments are more in context with the effects of the building on surrounding landmarks, our comments are more geared toward the architecture.
- I would suggest that on State Street you show the elevations of the surrounding structures. Your scale will be impacted. It needs to be studied in elevation with the adjacent context.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by O'Kroley, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0). The motion required the above stated concerns and the following:

- Specifically study lighting patterns showing what is there now and what will be there.
- Address landscaping comments.
- Address architecture comments by Scanlon and the Commission, especially by O'Kroley on history/preservation of existing walls.
- Reexamine appearance of base at parking area along east elevation at Fitch Court.

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 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 723 State Street**

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

General Comments:

- Level of green roof development and accessibility is impressive. Please don't lose this.
- Too busy and overbearing. Concerned about blocking sun on Library Mall and insufficient natural light inside.
- Ensure us that additional shade is not cast on the mall.