

## AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** September 5, 2012

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

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

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

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** September 5, 2012

**ID NUMBER:**

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of September 5, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the Madison College Downtown Campus Culinary Education Center located at 211 North Carroll Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Peter Tan, representing Madison College; Gene Devitt, representing the Mansion Hill Neighborhood/Capital Neighborhoods; and Tim Capper. Tan addressed issues raised at the previous meeting. Two-feet have been added to the setbacks which creates a 6-foot landscape area. Staff noted that the City’s Design Team is fine with the building’s architecture and expression but did express concern about the corner of the building’s second floor façade, which features extended air handling units at the Johnson Street and southerly façades. Tan emphasized that the roof element is a very important part of the architectural expression of the building. He further noted that the entire first floor will be clear glass. The Johnson Street façade is much simpler with three building material elements. Smaller scale plantings have been introduced for the Wisconsin Avenue façade. The stone on the building is similar in shade and texture to the limestone used at Truax.

Gene Devitt spoke in support, noting that the neighborhood fully supports this building.

Discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- The differences I see are very subtle. The comments about the setback and architecture; it’s almost the difference you’d expect between an initial approval and final approval. There’s no change at all. Moving a ceiling tile off the curb is very modest.
- Can you explain to me how this winged roof expresses the college?
  - There’s two elements that express the college. The vertical element and the element that creates that space in the dining hall.

You could have the space without that winged angle.

The winged angle provides the creative approach to this building. It adds to the exuberance. We looked at the Mansion Hill Neighborhood and came to understand that this is an expressive part of the building.

But it relates nothing to the college.

The Gateway building on the Truax Campus has a similar roof form.

- Did you incorporate the comments from last time about the building being too fussy?
  - After talking to Madison College, they felt the building was not too fussy.
- The tweaking of the landscaping helped. I caution you about pruning, it's eventually not going to happen so plantings will grow out to the sidewalk. The yews don't take a lot of afternoon sun, they're going to be brown. I like the layout but I'd think about a different plant.
- There's a missed opportunity as a member of the public along Johnson Street, along the bottom 3-feet for views in spandrel versus vision glass. You're not going to want spandrel glass to detract that view and note that grade changes will have a substantial impact on this area.
  - The spandrel glass will be in just that one spot.
- This building could be much more successful with some rather small minor changes.
- Still need a connective dialog between the two buildings; the windows as explained are not a real connection between the two buildings.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Lufler, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-3) with Rummel, Goodhart and O'Kroley voting no; and Slayton, Huggins, Lufler, Harrington and DeChant voting yes. The motion required the following:

- The planting reference on the face of the plan shall be identified on the Planting List. The Yews would fill the area in which they are located by themselves, need maintenance, will burn out with full sun. Think about a different plant.
- Replace "High Bush Cranberry" with more grasses.

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, 6 and 6.

**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
<b>Member Ratings</b>	5	5	6	6	-	6	4	5
	5	6	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5.5	-	5	-	-	-	7	5
	5	5	5	-	-	5	7	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	6	5	-	-	6	7	6

General Comments:

- Building design fussy, no substantial change from previously referred submittal.
- Building still seems too busy, too many design elements. Winged roof especially.
- Almost there. This building could be and should be a home run.
- Ped connection needs greater strength along Johnson Street.