

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: March 22, 2017

TITLE: 4904 Tradewinds Parkway – Amendment to a Conditional Use and Rezoning from IL to SE for an Education Center in a Proposed Office Building in UDD No. 1. 16th Ald. Dist. (45610)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: March 22, 2017

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Richard Slayton, Lois Braun-Oddo, Cliff Goodhart, Dawn O’Kroley, Rafeeq Asad, Tom DeChant, John Harrington and Michael Rosenblum.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 22, 2017, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of an amendment to a conditional use for an education center in a proposed office building located at 4904 Tradewinds Parkway in UDD No. 1. Appearing on behalf of the project was Jerry Bourquin, the project architect. Bourquin reviewed the changes since the informational presentation, including a reduction in the amount of metal, masonry base, and alterations to the window openings. The west elevation now includes a stone base and incorporation of windows. A reduction in the amount of parking will increase the amount of landscaping at the front of the building.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- What are the material samples?
 - Aluminum frame windows, metal champagne color siding.
- Which is more realistic, the glass in the renderings or in the elevations?
 - The glass is actually a clear glass, there isn’t any tint to it.
- Staff had a number of comments related to parking and screening. Those are Chapter 28 requirements and the applicant will be required to comply with those at the time of final site plan review before anybody signs off on it. This is in UDD No. 1 and the district says that metal shall not be used as an exterior material for buildings except as an integral part of a design of exceptional merit. In order to use the metal outside of the accent material the Commission would have to make a finding that this is a design of exceptional merit.
- The fenestration is improved; a coherent design that is acceptable.
- Architecturally, all of the other elements are what we discussed; because that is a singular metal element, it works with the composition.
- Place metal off to the side as an accent like all the other elevations, then you have that relationship on all sides. In terms of landscaping, go with ground cover (sedge) or additional shrubs; the retention area should be enhanced with how the landscaping shapes it. Right now the landscaping enhances the parking

lot shape; rather have it enhance the shape of the pond. You've reached the point value, but it looks sparse.

- You need to add canopy trees along this view, also this whole idea of screening and softening that view along the Beltline. We did talk about the mulch beds being at least 70% covered by vegetation and these look pretty sparse. Some of these groupings may spread up onto the curb and pavement. And here you have an attempt at a more natural appearance in the understory but you still have a straight line of Pears; they should work together somewhat.
- The infill above the awnings (masonry infill) seems tall. It should be proportional to the window below and the area of the darker block above. Could you take the bottom of the steel overhang and extend that line across to be the top of the infill line? It seems a little heavy still. It might help anchor the signage once you get to that point.
- I like that you've gone to a more metallic than beige metal, but I'm wondering if there should be more contrast between that and the rest of the building. From the way it's rendered they all are still in a tight family of color and I wonder if you want a little more drama between the elements to highlight that steel a bit more. The rough cut masonry could be a little bit darker, maybe more towards the charcoals to give it more contrast.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Braun-Oddo, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0).

The motion provided that the applicant implement the landscape and architecture comments as noted above; those changes can be approved administratively.