



Agenda Item #: 2

Project Title: 4725 Tradewinds Parkway - Modifications to a Previously Approved Industrial Building Located in Urban Design District (UDD) 1. 16th Ald. Dist.

Legistar File ID #: 77006

Members Present: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Christian Harper, Lois Braun-Oddo, Shane Bernau, Rafeeq Asad, Amanda Arnold, Marsha Rummel, and Russell Knudson

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of May 31, 2023, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of modifications to a previously approved building located at 4725 Tradewinds Parkway in UDD 1. Registered and speaking in support was Steve Shulfer. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Tim Brummels.

The UDC originally approved the project in 2021, with the owner acquiring the building in 2022 without having been involved in the design and construction. They are now trying to bridge the gap between what happened two years ago and where they are today. The project is located in a business district with a mix of office, flex industrial spaces, and a hotel. Existing conditions show a precast concrete plank building accented with color variations, metal trim and glazing. They are proposing to move the main entry further west, and will screen the mechanical equipment at the rear (south) of the building. Punched openings have been infilled with studs and plywood, they will open those and fill them with glazing into the laboratory space, adding a secondary exit. The precast that exists now is not a far cry from what was originally approved and therefore they do not wish to introduce another material, but propose to leave the tan precast as is and add metal panels where originally proposed. There was a deeper canopy at roughly three to four feet that was built as a single projection over the doorway and will expand it out to match what's existing now. They are proposing an alternate addition of windows on the upper level, eliminating the stone applied and extending some metal panel all over, essentially giving the building the same finish treatments as the front.

The Commission discussed the following:

- A neighboring building that we approved that is occupied by Kilgust has an extensive canopy and high clerestory windows; this building by comparison looks extremely flat. There are discrepancies between the elevations I saw in the approved presentation and what I'm seeing here.
- (Secretary) What you see on the existing elevations and proposed that you're not seeing is what UDC approved, some additional articulation with paint colors. That probably got changed at site plan review for zoning consistency.
- The tan portion was continuous from the wing wall to the back corner, which makes sense now, similar to the front. In real life, the building next door with the wrap around canopy, clerestories and further articulation with exposed pilaster columns, it's night and day between the two buildings. I don't miss anything with the applied veneer masonry, but the canopy and clerestory especially are what really make the building something more than just a tilt-up warehouse look.
- (Secretary) What you see of clerestory is what was approved by UDC and that is what is approved as part of the Site Plan Review and on file with the city.

- We do recognize that the applicant inherited this, we're not here to penalize them, just looking to get the building as close to a design that is consistent with the requirements in the Urban Design District.
- When I look at the existing and what is proposed, I feel like a good effort is being made, and recognize they have limitations based on what is built. I'll start with motion to approve, they are similar enough and effort is being made.
- It's pretty flat in real life without that continuous metal panel.
- I'm confused based on some of the final comments by the applicant that seem to indicate changing or creating these new windows has been complicated by revelations about what's involved in cutting through those panels. Will this proceed with staff approvals if it ends up not being exactly like what we're seeing on the proposed?
- (Secretary) Right now we have a motion to approve as proposed, including the addition of clerestory windows. If that is a particular concern it should be stated as part of the motion to be clear, that the clearstory windows are part of the approval. If they are not coming back with them because of construction feasibility, we should include language that it should come back to the Commission with an alternate design detail that would have to be added to the building to compensate for the lack of clerestory windows.
- It is clear to me that we would be approving clerestory windows that are not there now, that's what I would support. I thought the applicant said they didn't want to do those windows. I appreciate all the other efforts. It's a no-go if the clerestory windows are not part of the proposal.
- I will amend the motion to include that clerestory windows are part of the approval.
- It would be a stronger design with the canopy projecting all the way across as it was in the original design. Wondering if you would consider that amendment to the motion as well?
- That level of amendment would be a motion to amend, we'd look for a second to that amendment.

Harper seconded the motion for the amendment which would add a continuous canopy consistent with the original design. The amendment motion passed on a roll call vote of (7-1-1) with Arnold, Braun-Oddo, Bernau, Harper, Rummel, and Asad voting yes; Knudson voting no; and Goodhart non-voting.

Action

On a motion by Arnold, seconded by Braun-Oddo, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0).

The motion included the following:

- Findings that the proposed design is similar enough to the originally approved design.
- The clerestory windows as shown are to be included in the approval, and
- The addition of a continuous canopy consistent with the original design.