AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	**PRESENTED:** October 24, 2018
TITLE: Public Project and Major Alteration to PD Located at 200 South Pinckney Street (Block 88) – Judge Doyle. 4th Ald. Dist. (45612)	**REFERRED:**
	REREFERRED:
	REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary	**ADOPTED:** **POF:**
DATED: October 24, 2018	**ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Cliff Goodhart, Jessica Klehr, Tom DeChant, Craig Weisensel and Amanda Hall.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 24, 2018, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** for a major alteration to the PD for Judge Doyle located at 200 South Pinckney Street. Registered in support of the project were George Austin, James DeStefano, Patrick Burkle and Sabrina Tolley, all representing the City of Madison. The previously presented 2.5-inch battens have become an issue for Parking Utility, they are concerned people will climb on them. The design team studied that and have reduced it to ¾". DeStefano reviewed studies of pulling the battens across at the top, which changes the context of the massing and they feel what they originally proposed is the right direction. They reviewed the two options for entry doors, showing the original that was of concern for proportion to the overall size of the development. One option has a clear opening with a perceived opening of 4'7". The new scheme widens that door for a clear opening of 4'7" and a perceived opening of 5'6". Option B has a 4'7" clear opening, with fiber cement wall panel brought out to turn the corner on the exterior, with the potential for signage or addressing options as well and a perceived opening of 7'5". The batten now is a stamped aluminum that could finish similarly to the battens above while reducing the profile. This gives the same rhythm and appearance as the battens above. The corners are finished with a bent aluminum corner that goes all the way up to the cornice.

The Commission discussed the following:

- I appreciate the rendering of the idea to bring the white mass down a bit. The very top panel could be removed with a narrow band of black going across based on what you showed before being too much black. The building has a nice granite base and now the stamped metal panel and spandrel glass touch, but with no coping the entrance piece might be stronger if that thin black band acted like a cap to it. The wider the better on the openings.
    - It's unfortunate to see it without the tower. Those vertical elements intersecting is very crucial.
- The more I hear the more skeptical I get of the likelihood the tower will come back.
    - If the City Council approves the proposal, the likelihood is increased.

- This is the issue: we have a podium that may have something on top of it. I'm happy with the B option and wider doorways. I'm not real fond of the signage bit.
- Either of the options with the wider doors look more pleasing. Is Option B meant to be with that vertical signage there?

ACTION:

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Hall, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of Option B with incorporation of the smaller battens. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-1-1) with Goodhart voting no and Braun-Oddo recused.