



**Agenda Item #:** 2

**Project Title:** 2219 Monroe Street - Amendment to an Existing Comprehensive Design Review (CDR) of Signage. 13th Ald. Dist.

**Legistar File ID #:** 75848

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

**Prepared By:** Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

## Summary

At its meeting of March 15, 2023, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of an amendment to an existing Comprehensive Design Review of Signage located at 2219 Monroe Street. Registered in support was Dan Pietrzykowski. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Michael Elliott.

This item was approved as a consent item with the finding that all applicable standards are adequately addressed and with all the staff recommendations contained in the report.

## Action

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by Knudson, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0).



**Agenda Item #:** 3

**Project Title:** 750 Regent Street - Comprehensive Design Review of Signage (CDR). 4th Ald. Dist.

**Legistar File ID #:** 76216

**Members Present:** Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Amanda Arnold, Russell Knudson, Juliana Bennett, and Rafeeq Asad

**Prepared By:** Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

**Summary**

At its meeting of March 15, 2023, the Urban Design Commission

Registered and speaking in support were Mary Beth Growney Selene and Linda Irving.

Matt Tucker, Building Inspection Division Director provided an overview of the proposal. Residential building, 80 square foot per side projecting sign; staff does not believe the sign size or scale is appropriate for a residential building. Recommendation is to approve the broader CDR but recommend the projecting sign be limited to no more than 32 square feet at an appropriate lower level on the building.

The unique nature of this property has required has zero public right-of-way frontage and limited visibility from Regent Street. Student residents are transient in nature. Flexibility referenced in the 2020 plan allows for.

Residential building without benefit of street frontage. More limitations than any other area in the city and unique in that it is an infill to an underutilized site. The Atmosphere building is 12-story whose residents will be all students, it is essential that people can find the building. The proposal are modest in scope and size. Five locations of the building signage as proposed. Lyft, Uber, food and other general deliveries have different drivers all the time that will be looking for an entrance, not a building. The Hilton Garden Inn canopy sign is street-facing and exceeds the sign code. This building will change residents at least once per year; 55% of the student body is from out of state. The placement of the sign will not exceed the third floor story of the building. Staff recommendation for the building wall signage. Potential monument sign is for information only and is not part of this CDR request.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Clarification: is the staff recommendation okay with a 32 square foot blade sign based on that being the size of the blade sign of the Hilton Hotel?
  - That size is consistent with the size of the blade sign for the hotel. The ground sign coming in the future is what will get you on the site.
- I thought the code specified only somewhat less than 32.
  - Two requirements: 20 and 32 square feet related to the speed limit.
- The City is being fairly generous in allowing exceptions for most of the signs on this site, both canopy and blade signs, with the obvious discrepancy of what they are requesting. Keeping it basically the same size as the Hilton is a reasonable compromise.
- Interesting that this functions more like a hotel. It is hard to see and not all residential structures are the same. I am sympathetic to the.....but it is fair to have the same size as the hotel.

- If you move it below the third story windows I'm not sure it quite fits at 80 square feet. Maybe somewhere in between might be ideal, if you weren't considering code.

## Action

On a motion by Bernau, seconded by Braun-Oddo, the Urban Design Commission . The motion was passed on a vote of ( ).

Approval of CDR signs as proposed with exception of Sign A being limited to the 32 square feet as outlined by the staff report.



**Agenda Item #:** 4

**Project Title:** 849 E Washington Avenue + 10 S Paterson Street - Alteration to a Previously Approved Mixed-Use Building in Urban Design District (UDD) 8. 6th Ald. Dist.

**Legistar File ID #:** 76215

**Members Present:** Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Amanda Arnold, Russell Knudson, Juliana Bennett, and Rafeeq Asad

**Prepared By:** Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

## Summary

At its meeting of March 15, 2023, the Urban Design Commission

Registered and speaking in support were Nate Helbach, Jeff Davis and Brandon Adler. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Evan Dysart. Design progressions include flush metal panel to flush ACM panel; get a more durable product, larger product with less joints and cleaner edges, and addresses potential oil canning issues. Proposed change to use a matte black color in lieu of previous steel, change windows from dark bronze to black on podium and towers on all elevations. This eliminates potential staining from cladding onto other materials and durability concerns, better match to the brick tone to existing Gardner Baking building for better connection. Proposed changes to south elevation where mechanical louvers have changed in size and location. Required for constructability as design was finalized. Direct result of the louver change adjusts the art mural location and size. Proposed change to the planter wall height along north and east elevations along the podium base, reduces amount of proposed concrete planter wall face, brings planters closer to the street level for a better urban environment.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Biggest change is the color palette to the more black and white color scheme. Our motion last time specifically called for the pre-weathered steel.
- I can appreciate the durability issues but a similar color palette could be achieved with a different material. This being a mass timber building, the whole spirit and feeling seemed to be one of warmth and an organic nature; that cream and weathered steel coloration was more in line with that. The switch to a stark, modern cold black and white is a disappointment. When I shared this with friends they were confused thinking it was a colored building in a black and white photo; they overwhelmingly chose the original design.
  - I had similar sentiment. Byproduct of inflation with costs going through the roof. There's only one manufacturer that could supply the pre-weathered steel at an \$800,000 increase in cost. We had huge concerns about using corten that would weather on site; it stains everything in its path. We looked at 15 samples of faux materials.
  - Had gone through multiple options in a solid paint color to better match the original aesthetics of the pre-weathered steel. The main issue is getting that exact same color to match between the window frames, two cladding profiles as well as the multiple conditions to match that color. We'd end up with about 3-5 non-matching brown colors that we thought would look quite terrible.
- There is a wide range of colors available.
- Planter height change?
  - A

- Will there be enough soil to support the plants going in there?
- It does appear that the planting species wouldn't be affected so much by that planter depth change.
- Do you have any renderings of the changed façade? I believe the previous submittal had corten for the planter boxes as well, but I totally get not wanting to use something pre-weathered. Did you explore this façade color scheme with still a corten planter box?
  - We could look at that, originally those planters were concrete, it's just a change in height between the different submissions. For durability concerns, it is right up against the sidewalk with snow and salt, we felt concrete would be more robust, which is also why we lowered them to have them closer to grade for a better pedestrian experience.
- I think the weathering steel will be much more robust than concrete. If durability is actually an issue I wouldn't shy away from weathering steel there. It might be a nice pairing in terms of color palette with the new proposed charcoal cladding. I'd prefer that warmth as opposed to just another concrete planter wall.
- Was brick explored in alignment with the existing building?
  - Yes, brick was my preferred, but unfortunately the structure had already been finalized and it could not support brick.
- Compromised solution? Appreciate the comments of looking at the finer details and looking at it holistically. If you were to use some amount of corten product, as an accent, what would be the proposed location?
  - We are still studying adding some corten inside at the front desk. There is an overhang along Main Street that framed the entrance of the garage, with potential corten for that piece of metal (flat). We could also use it for all the planters, as Shane suggested.
- The planter boxes are more accessible to pedestrians than the surround of the garage door and would have a bigger impact in terms of bringing some of that corten back into the project.

## Action

On a motion by Knudson, seconded by \_\_\_\_\_, the Urban Design Commission \_\_\_\_\_. The motion was passed on a vote of ( \_\_\_\_\_ ).



**Agenda Item #:** 5

**Project Title:** 3715 E Washington Avenue - Renovation of an Existing Restaurant in Urban Design District (UDD) 5. 3rd Ald. Dist.

**Legistar File ID #:** 75637

**Members Present:** Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Amanda Arnold, Russell Knudson, Juliana Bennett, and Rafeeq Asad

**Prepared By:** Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

## Summary

At its meeting of March 15, 2023, the Urban Design Commission

Registered and speaking in support was Nathan Remitz. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Joe Ferguson.

Additional views of how the existing roof interacts with the parapet feature, and the painting of the existing brick and how it relates to the new materials. Prototypical buildings show same elevation and floor plans as what is proposed at this location. From the front the roofline is more or less hidden. The side view shows the existing roof, which will be re-shingled, fascia and walls painted and addition of new parapet feature. The signage shown is not part of this submittal. LED strip light on top of the wood parapet feature, 6 x 6 recessed alcove to provide a warm glow light at night. Updated landscape plans to use wood mulch in planting beds. The block retaining wall on the street side of the property is in good condition with a couple of missing cap blocks that will be updated and repaired as part of this remodel.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Does the project require the site be brought up to present day landscape standards?
  - No, we do have a site plan on file that will meet those standards but because they are not adding square footage it is not triggering any additional compliance.
- My major concern was the lighting, that was addressed and made a good faith effort on all the other issues.

## 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 (6-0).



**Agenda Item #:** 6

**Project Title:** 415 N Lake Street - Planned Development (PD) and Public Project for the New Lake Street Public Parking Ramp and Mixed-Use Building. 2nd Ald. Dist.

**Legistar File ID #:** 73342

**Members Present:** Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Amanda Arnold, Russell Knudson, Juliana Bennett, and Rafeeq Asad

**Prepared By:** Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

## Summary

At its meeting of March 15, 2023, the Urban Design Commission

Registered and speaking in support were Michael Oates, Nathan Gundrum, and John Chapman. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Shane Grandbois, Taylor Duerr, and Carter Lanser. Registered in support but not wishing to speak was Claire Lommen.

Have received all their approvals from other bodies. Address of previous comments: Incorporate substantial plantings along Lake Street, increased from 2' diameter to 4' diameter, increased number of plantings and amount, now four times what is required by city point system. Updated to provide additional bike detail on Hawthorne Court. The reconstruction of Hawthorne Court will be processed as a separate project with the City's Public Works Division. Refinements of the column treatment on Lake Street, added a cladding to the concrete to complement the rest of the enclosure system. Provide refinements on building corners and north south elevations; introduced brick color and patterning to further articulate the building. Streetscape detail:

The Commission discussed the following:

- There might be a difference in interpretation of the word articulation. I thought the location of this project warranted a lot more, I know we talked about that, but I don't know that I see it in this presentation. I see the changes but I still see a very flat, safe, standard building. To me articulation is more than a stripe, this is still missing the mark for me.
- Thank you for increasing both the number and the size of the round planters out front, which did not jive at all with the planting design specified for them. The entry area will be much more welcoming. Black-eyed Susan is specified, Rubekia Herda is not the right kind to have in a setting like this; more an open meadow. Compact bred for container called little gold star, go with that and good luck because trying to keep plants alive in that environment with all the abuse they take is a tough go, kudos for making the effort.
- Using Silva cells for the trees out front, that is to be applauded and makes a huge difference in the long-term health and prospects of those trees to survive there.
- Happy to see some type of cladding over the concrete pillars, I actually like the silver better than white but anything is better than bare concrete.
- Just changing the color of the brick for detail on the corners, it's better than nothing but definitely not real articulation or anything dynamic. Maybe it's the best we can expect in this scenario.
-

## Action

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by Knudson, the Urban Design Commission . The motion was passed on a vote of ( ).

Specie of of black eyed susans

Agree about the articulation. Applaud the applicant and am excited about art along that Hawthorne east façade. Is there a way to include that as a requirement of our approval? Activating it would go a long way with something besides just the brick bands we're seeing on the building materials. Layer multiple things like this for the pedestrian experience would help.

Staff: Coordination between design of streetscape of Hawthorne and art installations in this area, process start sometime this spring. Since this is a public project, regardless of whatever type of art installation, we can put a final approval condition if there's any art they need to come back to UDC. We cannot require art as part of the articulation.



# URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION MEETING REPORT

March 15, 2023



**Agenda Item #:** 7

**Project Title:** 432 S Junction Road - Public Project for a Bus Rapid Transit Junction Road Terminal. 1st Ald. Dist.

**Legistar File ID #:** 76217

**Members Present:** Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Amanda Arnold, Russell Knudson, Juliana Bennett, and Rafeeq Asad

**Prepared By:** Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

## Summary

At its meeting of March 15, 2023, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**

Registered in support was Mike Cechvala.

This item was approved as a consent item with the finding that all applicable standards are adequately addressed and with all the staff recommendations contained in the report.

## Action

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by Knudson, the Urban Design Commission . The motion was passed on a vote of ( ).



|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| <b>Agenda Item #:</b>      | 8   |
| <b>Project Title:</b>      | 121 E. Wilson Street - Alteration to a Previously Approved Mixed-Use Building in UMX Zoning. 4th Ald. Dist.   |
| <b>Legistar File ID #:</b> | 71621   |
| <b>Members Present:</b>    | Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Amanda Arnold, Russell Knudson, Juliana Bennett, and Rafeeq Asad |
| <b>Prepared By:</b>        | Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary   |

## Summary

At its meeting of March 15, 2023, the Urban Design Commission

Registered and speaking in support were Dan Kennelly, Brian Reed, and Andrew Laufenberg. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Rebecca De Boer.

Modifications to the project are mostly adjustments made over the last few months to enhance the user experience of the building. Frame that surrounds the glass volumes along Wilson Street used to capture the balconies has been pulled inward to expand the views from those balconies. The reconfiguration clusters the metal panels in a matter that allows for more use for those users. The articulation has been reduced to reflect closer to a human scale, and to install visual interest within the panels, they themselves cant in a right or left justification to create dance and shadow throughout the day. As the panels move up the façade their frequency is reduced. Now clustered into three columns creating a random lighting effect up the building façade. To add a secondary level of detail a reveal has been added to the elements, moving randomly up the façade. Also implemented this patterning on the glassier portion highlighting the promenade. At the terrace level the notable change is a cable rail system versus the glass railings from the previous iteration. This provides more visibility to the lakes and views from balconies, while eliminating the need for bird safe glass. The side elevation and courtyards introduced more brick and decreased the amount of glazing for greater contrast between the solid and glassier elevations of the building. A previous accent brick detail at the spandrel level is expanded on by taking it in a vertical application to create more visual interest within that space. The side and courtyard balconies which were previously recessed have been pulled out roughly 30 inches to create a better interior layout, provide more natural light into the units and providing the opportunity for these users to have better potential views. The updated lighting, couldn't find a solution to be fully dark sky compliant, as well as management and facilities teams that the lights would provide a potential maintenance challenge and obstacle for snow and other accumulations. The new current design removes the metal panel accent lighting, keeping the uplights to illuminate the underside of the balcony slabs, the promenade area and courtyard area.

The Commission discussed the following:

- This is another example...we're all design related professionals in various capacity, and design is subjective. Our job is to give direction without designing the building for you. A lot of the comments we made previously were detriment to this project. The previously designs were much more successful and I loved this project. Now we have cluttered facades where they were so dynamic before, the gradation and patterns were clear and now it looks like a bunch of lines on glazing. It's more clutter than design. I understand why, but now I feel like this is

just in response to comments you got you changed something that worked really well and more successfully than we have now. You had a much more successful project before. I like the promenade space now.

- We approved the previous images, this has come back at the request of the development team, not us. I agree with you, the new canted panels are not in keeping with the original design of the building. Those pleated bent panels versus these sticking out randomly is not as successful as it was.
- Sorry to see you back for some of these things. The under-balcony lighting, will the occupant have control of that fixture, is it always on, controlled by the landlord?
  - The intent is it would be a typical balcony light where they have switched control.
- That might be a detriment as a design element as you're communicating here, but it is better to give the occupants control over that part of their environment.
- The operable windows, are they awning style, how do they move?
  - They would be awning style.
- I still like this project but I agree, if you put the two versions side-by-side, it's a slam dunk that visually I prefer the former proposal. If I lived here I would want that hanging balcony, but for everyone else looking at it I think it's a protrusion on an otherwise well-designed building. The ones in the courtyard bother me quite a bit, but the ones on the corners that broke up that otherwise really nice dynamic framing that accented the random pattern that has been diminished, it's going backwards as far as I'm concerned. It's disappointing because it looked better.
- Not surprised it doesn't meet the dark sky compliance. The balconies look better at night with the soft lighting underneath. It's still a cool project, looking forward to seeing it and the public spaces. Wish it would stay closer to its previous version.
- Do some articulation with some flat panels and clean it up, make the façade a little bit more taut and less random three-dimensionally.
- It is definitely a good urban design project. I remember the façade comments that weren't the most favorable, why are we looking at this again? What made you say we're just going to abandon the previous design to go to this? This was a lot of extra work, what triggered changing the facade adding a lot more detail and reveals and vertical pieces? Why are we here?
- They indicated more visibility for occupants, but I have to think there are budget issues too.
  - Yes, as we've continued to look at the design and building, the budget and making it work financially is necessary. In terms of the panel orientation, part of it was shifting those around to better align with demising wall and vertical chases for heat pumps, things like that. With the windows mullion pattern change, we needed to adjust the operable window to be more ADA compliant and more durable.
- Is there a way to accomplish what you tried but with a lot less business? Maybe it's just one bigger angled panel rather than three. How do you simplify some of the design moves? There's an operable window and a gap that seems random, what is that? Just a design?
  - That slit is the reveal we added in an effort to create a randomness across the entire façade because the panels were clustered. The 'peg' you're seeing was us exploring additional light that we opted not to move forward with that, it never got removed from the rendering.
- Might just be to get rid of that reveal and make something bigger. Just have one singular vertical mullion. It's not bad but maybe simplifying so it's two instead of three, it's just too much. One more pass at refining this within your budgetary constraints, tone it down just a little bit.
- Before it was pleasingly random and now it's kind of chaotic.
- Those channels all I see is bird nests. If you just made that a wider mullion that might get rid of some of that chaotic look. I don't mind the larger panels and how they look but they don't have the rhythm the other panels had.
- As much as I agree I think the protruding balconies work on the corners, but on the inside of the courtyard and facing other buildings, people want views to the lake but maybe in the courtyard they lose privacy. It's a great project and I really do still like it.
- What we've lost was the big move of those panels and that gradation that was on a much larger scale. Now it's so much more fine grained, it adds to that business. I would love to see a larger moving grain in this building.

Some units might have less glazing than others but I think that's totally worth it for the building design as a whole. I did prefer the glass railing on the lakeside. We talked quite a bit about the balconies before, exposed open corner on the Wilson Street elevation is moving in the opposite direction of where all our comments were previously. There was a way that still had plenty of sight lines without these wide open corners.

- A lot of subjective things here and I'd hate to have to see it again. Motion for approval but ask that the channels shown on elevations be either filled in or removed somehow (become a wider panel, whatever you choose). Hate to dictate how much or little some of these panels are added or removed.

## Action

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by \_\_\_\_\_, the Urban Design Commission \_\_\_\_\_. The motion was passed on a vote of ( \_\_\_\_\_ ).

Discussion:

Secretary: Clarify for final?

Final approval.

I agree as much as I don't want this to come back to us again, it might be one that is worth it to see how some of these things shake out.

If we're going to revisit channels we may revisit the façade. Making panels bigger, taking one away, all the same details on the same exterior. Look at this holistically and not just fill in the channels.

Agree that this design is back to an earlier state than the applicant wants to be at. Bigger moves that articulate a design across the building as opposed to little accent details really resonated with me. I would also be in favor of seeing this project again.

Not that all the reveals have to be filled in, somehow removed or filled in. The architects can use what we've said about combination or contrast between the past iteration and this one to give us essentially what we're asking for by not just filling in the reveals, either filling in or removing them. I wasn't dictating that they all get filled in.

I think it's more than filling in those reveals, stepping back and looking at the composition of all these canted panels, maybe coming up with something cleaner and keeping with the original design intent.

Motion by Asad, seconded by Bernau, initial. Accepts masonry, balcony treatments and lighting.

Sec: list for applicant for direction.

This is an exciting project. Don't want to dictate specifics but do want to say the façade took a step backwards. Relook and come up with some of those other things on their own without specifying railing has to be glass, etc.

Had them focus on the façade elements: metal panel and window mullion patterning and spacing and detailing.

In doing that maybe some of those other things will happen.

The general configuration of the balconies, the balcony railing treatments are ok.

My suggestion would be the window wall system and the metal panel system design and detail and not focus so much on the balcony reconfigurations or the railing types or any of the landscaping or anything else changed as a result of the design progression.



**Agenda Item #:** 9

**Project Title:** 750 University Row - Amendment to an Approved Planned Development (PD) for Expansion of UW Health Located in UDD 6. 19th Ald. Dist.

**Legistar File ID #:** 76633

**Members Present:** Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Christian Harper, Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Amanda Arnold, Russell Knudson, Juliana Bennett, and Rafeeq Asad

**Prepared By:** Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

## Summary

At its meeting of March 15, 2023, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for expansion of UW Health located at 750 University Row in UDD 6. Registered and speaking in support were Jenni Eschner, Jen Voigt, and Michael McKay. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Dietmar Bassuner and Paul Lenhart.

The existing PD did envision expansion of the health clinic. Existing site is a lot of surface parking lot; existing opportunity to increase density and activation. Existing primary entry is facing existing surface parking area with canopy drop-off area. Active space with transfer vehicles and pick-ups, existing condition comingles with existing entry for staff and other patients. Proposed site plan pushes height and density towards University Row as opposed to the “street” side. New entry proposed as north as possible within the scope of the new project. Extending bike path to the southern extent of the property line. Proposing patient drop-off at the front of the building, will demolish existing to make way for the expansion. Put as much parking as possible underground and all parking will be within the structure. Four story clinic on top of a three story parking structure. Go to tape...

50% covered parking structure with green roof and other 50% solar panels to meet their project sustainability goals. Enter parking at the top and work their way down. Scale lower on western where it abuts single family residential and will screen as much as possible with landscaping. Push and pulls to differentiate the massing. Introducing a bit of vertical to this façade into the stone and balance the overall street experience. Horizontal roof in strategic locations with overhang elsewhere for interest and hierarchy in the façade. Patient circulate and wait along the glass at every level for transparency. Streamlined canopy to drop off. Activate the pedestrian sidewalk at the same time to facilitate that experience. Cladding for the parking picks up on the brick color of the building. Bioretention areas, storm sewer rerouting, new TOD layer bisects the site. Option to rotate the building, 30% of façade is within 20-feet of the street. If needed to meet that 20 foot setback would rotate the building about 4 degrees. Similarly the drop-off is not allowed but is a unique need for their patients. Needing to combine a portion of lot 2 in order to fit program onto the site, now causes TOD line to traverse southern portion of the site. can the boundary be moved as part of the site reworking? The drop off is critical to their program, serving a large geriatric population via shuttle or bus. Arrive at front door, also have transfer of patients post procedure in a wheelchair. Covered drop off is essential for those patients. Continuing to work through this with City staff. 20-foot setback, rotating building poses structure in the geometries involved. The street follows the topography of the site, looking at options to push the façade, if drop-off is allowed gives more room.

The Commission discussed the following:

- We don't control the TOD or any relief on the setback for this project.

- The TOD overlay would require an amendment to the zoning ordinance as a separate process, UDC is not a reviewing agency on those request. This is a PD, any modifications to the TOD overlay is the same as a setback modification to standard zoned district. Think about the PD review and approval standards in thinking about those exceptions.
- The PD cannot be exempt from the PD overlay district?
- It can.
- Still useful to understand how the design is where it is.
- Overall I like it, fits well into the context. You've had conversations with the neighbors to the west who want the lower building height. I do have concerns about them looking back at the wall of the parking garage. If you could flip the green roof with the solar panels, those would be viewed more from University Avenue and thereidents would have a view of the green roof instead.
  - The houses are lower, I don't imagine they will look upon the roof. From a site planning perspective, the green roof is more north/northwest facing, the investment in solar wouldn't pay back there because they would be shaded most of the day.
- It looks like a really nice melding of the new building and the existing building. Sometimes these kinds of projects look like two separate parts awkwardly put together. These come together in a way that looks like it was designed as one, a big plus.
- How exciting it is to see this much green roof and solar on one project. From an operational standpoint of a green roof over an unheated parking garage as opposed to an occupied heated building, are there technical issues that would be challenging with that?
  - UW Health has recently pursued this method, we'll continue to work through that aspect with our designers and landscape architects.
- Good luck on the various exceptions for the drop-off area. I've recently had to take my mom to UW facilities, I can attest to how important a covered drop-off area is. At the same time you do have a challenging issue with what is probably going to be busier and busier traffic out front. Look forward to seeing how this project progresses.
- I think it looks really nice, you did a good job of giving it its own identify and yet looking cohesive with the existing structure. I like the parking structure, the panels are nice and warm, the texture. Rendering A12 where at the end of the building that blank wall, anything planned for that? You can see that it's going to be pretty visible.
  - Functionally we were trying to avoid air handlers popping up everywhere. There's opportunity to break up that massing, even if it can't be transparent there.
- I'm trying really hard to critique and coming up short, I really like this project. Future expansion of the parking garage or the building coming out over the garage considered?
  - We are pretty much maximizing this site with this project. We don't have major plans for vertical expansion or horizontal expansion over a vertical area.
- Kudos to the team, it's a huge benefit that this ramp was submerged and not creating a bigger mass. It's a wonderful design.
- Looks like a nice project, very excited to see that green roof. There is green roof on the existing building, I would strongly advocate that this green roof be at least a semi-intensive profile for more stormwater retention, less maintenance and plugging it with pollinators. I look forward to seeing that in future presentations.
- The address 750 is probably not part of this approval, but the numbers are gigantic.
- The wall containing the relief from the garage, you might look into the inflation \_\_\_\_\_, might be advantageous.
- I would hope that the building design and siting isn't dictated on a minor discrepancy in some percentage of façade within a boundary. I'm seeing how the pedestrian would have to move around the drop off and back to the sidewalk, I much prefer the "original" site plan where the sidewalk goes straight across and the drop off really is for vehicles. This isn't a department or grocery store, if we can minimize confusion with pedestrians who want to just walk past the building it would be better off. If the PD can dictate that in its zoning designation hopefully that's the way the developer can go.

## Action

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.