

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: October 18, 2006	
TITLE: 9701 Brader Way – PUD(SIP), Office Building. 9 th Ald. Dist. (04545)	REFERRED:	
	REREFERRED:	
	REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: October 18, 2006	ID NUMBER:	

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Lou Host-Jablonski, Cathleen Feland, Lisa Geer, Todd Barnett, Michael Barrett, Robert March, Ald. Noel Radomski and Bruce Woods.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 18, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED CONSIDERATION** of a PUD(SIP) for an office building located at 9701 Brader Way. Appearing on behalf of the project were Brian Munson, Keith Kaetterhenry, Tom Knoop, Fredric Schuhmacher, Bruce Hollar and Leslie Portz. The modified plans as presented featured the following:

- Widened planting areas peripheral and internal to the surface parking lot.
- An outdoor break area has been provided, along with a pedestrian connection to pathways to the adjacent detention pond facilities on the outlot to the east, in addition a pedestrian access has also been provided along the south elevation to provide access to the parking lot oriented entranceway.
- A pedestrian walkway has been provided along the westerly elevation of the building to Brader Way.
- A walkway has been provided along the building's frontage to Brader Way to provide for potential first floor access.
- Bike stalls have been distributed both internally and externally on the site, including within the lower level parking facility.
- Loading has been incorporated within a drive aisle to increase the amount of landscaped open space within lawn covered planting infiltration areas located between perpendicularly oriented bays of parking.
- Additional first floor building entries can be provided with the conversion of oversized windows on both the street sides of the building combined with the conversion for individual tenants spaces.
- The landscaping plan features enhancement of landscaping amenities along Mineral Point Road. The overhead canopy has been eliminated; the parapet now follows the curve of the upper front entry elevation oriented to the surface parking lot.
- The array of building materials include a field utility brick, "Iron Spot" an accent brick in a modular size, green glass, smooth face masonry block with the utilization of EIFS on upper portions of all elevations, and precast stone with a limestone finish.

- In response to a request to provide for more on-site infiltration, the applicants noted that the soils limit true infiltration, only water quality can be affected utilizing the proposed bioretention area along Mineral Point Road.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- The proposed use of crabapple species within the surface parking lot is inappropriate. Replace with a better/larger shade tree.
- The building turns its back on its street frontages, as well as the corner with its entry oriented to the backside (parking lot). There is no guarantee that the proposed door entry along Brader Way will be active, entry needs to be at corner.
- Parking at 3-4 stalls per 1,000 square feet as described in the GDP is at the high end; need to encourage parking on street, which is allowed but is discouraged if the front door is not on the front street and with the on-site parking levels as proposed.
- Need more transparency of the building to the street.
- The opaqueness of the glass is bothersome; consider other means available for solar control.
- The architecture with the site and building orientation does not have urban sensibility.
- The glass needs to have interaction to be able to see people in the building.
- Reluctantly voted for the GDP based on the promise of shared parking with the church. This building's peak parking needs could utilize this measure. The GDP text relevant to the provision of underground parking to be encouraged means the 3-4 stall per 1,000 square foot ratio should be satisfied with this provision. Building parking as you need it; not years in advance of need.
- Relative to architecture, the column spacing grid doesn't relate to the architecture of the façade, need to make building more friendly, consider modifications to the material palette, column spacing and other measures such as a heavier base than cornice treatment.
- The main view from Mineral Point Road of the south elevation is of the garage door entry to lower level parking; needs screening.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by March, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED**

CONSIDERATION. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1-1) with Barrett voting no and Geer abstaining. The motion required address of the above and the following:

- Examine ways for building to address street and to provide prominent entries (dedicated).
- Look at the scale of the architecture of the building, use of materials and scale of windows and openings.
- Look at alternatives to opaque glass.
- Modify the landscape plan to address comments by the Commission.
- Reexamine how the building relates to the corner of Brader Way and Veritas Drive.
- Third floor level is not correctly expressed on drawings in regards to utilization of spandrel glazing, correct.
- Look at different treatment of glazing on the various elevations.

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 4, 5, 5, 5, 5 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 9701 Brader Way

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	5	6	-	-	5	5	5
	5	4	6	-	-	5	5	5
	4	4	-	-	-	-	4	4
	5	5	5	6	-	5	5	5
	6	5	6	-	-	7	6	6
	5	4	5	6	-	6	4	5

General Comments:

- This building will be a black box with no views into building due to dark glass. Better solar control can be done with different materials.
- Building is unlovely, and with the mirrored green glass, unwelcoming. Turns it back emphatically to the street.
- Not a friendly building.
- Wheelchair entry at main entry; solar gain can be handled with architectural devices such as overhangs and awnings; entry at parking lot is not acceptable; parking count is way too high; poor soils, should not be a crutch for excuse for lack of landscaping.
- GDP, text ended up being completely different from what we approved at UDC: the shared parking, as promised, at the GDP submittal ended up getting “switched” out for a lot more paving. This should not be approved until the shared parking is reintroduced. Lack of a corner entrance makes for just another suburban office park building.