

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: August 22, 2012

TITLE: 211 North Carroll Street – School
Building, Madison College Downtown
Campus Culinary Education Center. 4th
Ald. Dist. (26177)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: August 22, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Richard Slayton, Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, John Harrington, Cliff Goodhart, Dawn O’Kroley and Melissa Huggins.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 22, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of the Madison College Downtown Campus Culinary Education Center located at 211 North Carroll Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Peter Tan, Jeff Gaard, Bruce Morrow and Tim Casper, all representing Madison College; and Eugene Devitt. Modified plans were presented representing changes to the building’s architecture and site/landscape plan details. Following the presentation, discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- Have you done a study to how the parking ramp relates to the building?
- It doesn’t look like you have a consistent radius in the modified area of the drive aisle curve in the ramp. Also, look at planter in the courtyard having a 45° as others. You’ve got 45° angles and a square planter jutting out. That’s not strong enough for the juxtaposition.
- Related to the strong urge to preserve the parking and the way that has driven the site for the building, is there a master site plan for how the rest of that corner would be developed in the future?
 - At this point we do not.
- There’s a lot going on here with nothing that holds it together (architecturally). It could be a bit more subtle. It calls attention to itself, it should be more subtle. I see a suburban branch bank here. The metal panel is very office park commercial, it’s not an institutional material in my mind. Too much going on; 1 or 2 themes architecturally instead of 7 or 8.
- How this relates to the existing context is very hard to judge because we don’t see any of that; not provided. Study how building touches the street at a pedestrian level. Need views of structure in context with existing MATC building The proportions of the openings (in my recollection) is much more vertical and this building overall feels very horizontal. The whole thing overall feels smaller and squat and as though your first floor windows are too similar in proportion to the basement windows of the adjacent existing buildings. It defeats its purpose from a distance as you begin the approach.
- Troubled by angle on northeast elevation.

- There's some uncomfortable about how the building sits with your setbacks. There are tall plantings blocking the foundation. I don't understand the relationship a person would have to the edge with the treatment of the landscape.
- I don't understand why this has to have so many different design elements. Modern architecture does not have to have a lot of angles, intersections and materials.
- I do find the southeast elevation to be the most restrained. I have trouble with the angled piece on the northwest elevation. The southeast seems the simplest.
- The columns are so strong; I wonder if you don't want your plantings as deliberate as the columns. You might want something with maybe a purplish color. You can make it a little bit simpler.
- Choice of Maple is invasive, replace. Serviceberry is lost in its application; look at something stronger.
- Question that there is adequate room for Gold Coast Junipers; will crowd out other plantings.
- Concern with the lack of adequate building setbacks along Johnson Street and Wisconsin Avenue as previously noted. The setback on Johnson Street should complement the First United Methodist and Bethel Lutheran and the setback on Wisconsin acknowledging its iconic green corridor.
- Revisit plantings along Johnson Street, the vertical columns of the building are so strong; plantings should be deliberate as the columns.
- Concern was expressed with the modified façades that provide for views into relocated air handling units on Johnson Street (northwest and southwest elevations).
- Consider using canopy trees to screen views of venting for air handling units at second floor.
- Karl Forester Feather Reed Grass seed heads are similar in color to the back lying façade, look at simplifying treatment.

Gene Devitt spoke in support of this project. He spoke of the numerous parking areas in the surrounding area and the excitement of a new walkable area. This project really enhances the neighborhood. There was initial concern with the setbacks but after looking at the benefits they now are in support.

ACTION:

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion to refer requested that the Planning Design Review Staff Team provide input, the provision of context with existing adjoining structures in design and elevation with further consideration of setback issues along Wisconsin Avenue and Johnson Street, as previously discussed at the May 2, 2012 informational presentation, as well as architectural and landscaping issues as noted.

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, 5 and 5.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 211 North Carroll Street

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	4	4	6	6	-	5	4	5
	-	5	6	6	-	6	-	5.5
	5	5	5	-	-	5	6	5
	5	5	5	-	-	4	6	5
	4	6	-	-	-	-	-	-

General Comments:

- Setback is problematic given site's particular corner. Too intrusive, too busy.
- Almost there – need to see illustrated context, not just massing and review how building elements relate to neighbors.
- Still too tight to the street. Building design could be simplified. Need to see full relationship to older MATC buildings.