

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

|  |   |
|--|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION   | <b>PRESENTED:</b> August 8, 2007                                |
| TITLE: 34 Schroeder Court – New Construction,<br>Office Building in UDD No. 2. 1 <sup>st</sup> Ald.<br>Dist. (06638) | <b>REFERRED:</b><br><b>REREFERRED:</b><br><b>REPORTED BACK:</b> |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary  | <b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>                                     |
| DATED: August 8, 2007  | <b>ID NUMBER:</b>   |

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Richard Slayton, Michael Barrett and Todd Barnett.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of August 8, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of an office building located at 34 Schroeder Court. Appearing on behalf of the project were G. Welman, Ray Rodenbeck and Roy Stalowski. The modified plans as presented featured the following:

- The surface parking on the east side of the building has been adjusted to provide for an additional 6-foot of landscape area.
- The loading area has been relocated to the front face of the building.
- The overall layout has been reexamined and modified to provide for the preservation of 12 large existing trees on the property.
- The entry to the ramp has been reoriented to the north-south axis.
- An outside lunch area has been provided along the west side of the building adjacent to an internal lunch room.
- The landscaping has been increased to a level double that of which is minimally required.
- The architecture has been reworked to create recesses and off-sets on all façades, in-set windows with the utilization of two different colors of brick.
- Previously stated concerns relevant to spandrel panels were further elaborated on by the applicant; emphasizing that spandrel panels didn't appear in significant quantities and are limited primarily to the lower level of the building.
- A review of ground signage was presented where staff noted that 173 square foot wall sign on the upper portions of the third floor's northern elevation was inconsistent with the provisions of Urban Design District No. 2 that limited its size to 40 square feet; requiring a variance and separate public hearing.

Roy Stalowski, a member of the family which owns several adjacent residential apartment buildings spoke in favor of the project. Further comments by the Commission noted the following:

- Provide no curbs on islands where saving trees, also need to identify what type of trees to be preserved.
- Adjust stalls to be 16-feet in length to the curb stop to provide more area with the preservation of trees.
- The mercury vapor fixtures should be eliminated in favor of the use of metal halide.

- The wall sign is too large and requires reconsideration to be more consistent with the provisions of Urban Design District No. 2.
- The glass on the building has too much of a tint.
- Like changes to building and building design and site plan, all of which are much improved.
- The tree preservation plan as distributed is not the same as in the packet. The note indicating optional island necessary to save two adjacent existing trees along the northeasterly boundary of the site should be mandatory.
- Relevant to the spandrel issue, typically the proposed elevations detail and note the location of which panels will be spandrel. Further consideration of the project requires that the elevations need to be modified and brought back for further review that detail locations of spandrels; full bays of spandrels may be an issue.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (5-0). The motion required:

- The lighting plan be modified to utilize metal halide fixtures, along with revisions to the photometric plan.
- Exterior signage shall come back for separate consideration along with a request for any necessary variances from the provisions for Urban Design District No. 2.
- The parking stalls on the periphery shall be modified to a 16-foot depth, 2-foot overhang to minimize paving.
- Alternatives to the proposed tint of glazing shall be provided for further review.
- Locate the proposed use of spandrel panels on all elevations. Provide consistent detailing of the site plan to reflect the preservation of the 12 existing trees on the site, curbing in islands around the trees to be preserved shall be modified to provide for more infiltration.
- A tree preservation plan shall be provided which identifies the species of each tree to be maintained on the site with an arborist to look at their condition and feasibility for preservation, as well as provide a tree protection plan as part of a report.
- Need to see details of the bike rack type to be consistent with City requirements, as well as provide opportunities for bike parking within the lower level garage.

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, 6, 6, 6 and 6.5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 34 Schroeder Court**

|                       | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>Member Ratings</b> | 5         | 5            | 5              | 5                              | 3     | 5                                   | 4             | 5              |
|                       | 6         | 7            | 7              | 5                              | 5     | 6                                   | 6             | 6              |
|                       | 6         | 6            | 6              | 6                              | 6     | 6                                   | 6             | 6              |
|                       | 6.5       | 6.5          | 7              | 6                              | 6     | 7                                   | 7             | 6.5            |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | -             | 6              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |

General Comments:

- Major worry regarding spandrel glass!
- Site lighting should be metal halide.
- Do not install curbs at islands with existing trees to be saved.
- Site plan and building architecture much improved.