

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> August 18, 2010
TITLE: 1552 University Avenue – PUD(GDP-SIP) for Wisconsin Energy Institute, New Laboratory Building. 5 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (16837)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: August 18, 2010	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner and Melissa Huggins.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of August 18, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP) for both phases of the project, and an SIP for the first phase of the project located at 1552 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Eric Lawson and Patrick Gleason, representing the State of Wisconsin; Gary Brown, representing UW-Madison; Ken Saiki, representing Ken Saiki Design; Ald. Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, representing the 5<sup>th</sup> Aldermanic District; and John Schlaefer, representing the Regent Neighborhood Association; Staff reminded the Commission to be very specific about their recommendations and conditions relative to the overall PUD-GDP for both Phase I and II and the PUD-SIP for Phase I. Lawson provided revised plans showing the relationship to the nave of the church across the street by dropping the fifth floor office block, creating a significant setback and lowering the leading edge. A different pattern of exterior has been introduced with yellow brick that matches the rest of University Avenue, with zinc metal panels on the interior, to simplify and provide symmetry. He noted that by changing the fifth floor the entire building has been reprogrammed, because of an uneven number of offices to match with laboratories. Updated plans show fifty-five (55) parking stalls on the east side of the building, doubled from the last time. Bike and moped parking is being provided on the west and back sides of the building. Saiki reviewed the landscape plans, including detention and demonstration areas. A café and patio space is available along University Avenue, along with a full garden space set back from University Avenue. The lighting design includes two poles, along with lighting underneath entryway overhangs. Minimal lighting will be provided on the access drive between this building and the ROTC building. Some lighting is being provided behind the high buy screen wall for maintenance. Offices from the fifth floor have been moved down through the building and reduced the element of exposure on the south side of the building allowing for the stepback above the fourth floor along the University Avenue elevation. A sound study has been completed, reading noise from six different locations around the building and in the neighborhood, as far away as Summit. It is believed all the systems for the building will be within the sound criteria of the existing noise generated levels. Three areas of the building have been refined based on Commissioner’s comments from the last meeting. The east story façade has been simplified with brick on the left and right sides of the building and zinc bars in the center, highlighted by the light well in the middle; a sort of bookend design. The brick face is turned closer to the old University Avenue/neighborhood side. The window pattern has been simplified by removing the middle row of windows, leaving a single window at each of the stair landings. Since packets were issued, the zigzag of the conference

room on the end has been changed by adding one more bay of the vertical accent piece/office fenestration. All spandrel glass has been left in the center to highlight the main entries. A wind tunnel study is being performed on the stacks. Different colored paving and possibly accent stripes will be used at the main entry to the building. Larger brick band reveals will be used to break up the mass of the tower over the main lab façade. The louver of the main mechanical intake of the lab air handling units will have a darker paint to match accent stripes, with accent stripes repeating down the tower. Public testimony was as follows:

- John Schlaefer of the Regent Neighborhood Association spoke, noting that they are very appreciative of how the UW has worked to address the neighborhood concerns. However, they still have serious concerns about Phase II massing and how it will affect the church and the street. The Regent Neighborhood Association does support Phase I.
- Ald. Shiva Bidar-Sielaff spoke, thanking the University for their hard work. She spoke to the neighborhood's two remaining concerns: the GDP approval for Phase II, which she requested be tabled at this time and that the Commission just concentrate on the GDP approval for Phase I. She noted discomfort with the massing and scaling of Phase II. She also spoke to the height of the stacks and their hopes that their heights will be dictated by a Commission decision.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The trees along Campus Drive could be larger to go with the mass and help pull that scale down.
- The east façade still looks kind of “sandwichy” to me. I have no problem with the massing of the building.
- It looks a lot better; seems like a much more attractive and coherent building.
- Appreciate that you brought down the height.
- The Campus Drive renderings look really cool.
- I really like the height. I know the neighborhood and Madison struggles with height and I appreciate the changes that you made.
- How will the glass atrium feature be highlighted at night?
  - There will be enough ambient light in the building to highlight this feature without light spillage occurring. You'll be able to see straight through it.
- The small windows on the stairwell are reminiscent of an older type of architecture. It's a juxtaposition of great open glass and tiny “Soviet” style windows.
- The height change is the nod you needed and it gives you more freedom elsewhere.
- The masonry on the office piece is a nicer, more subtle read.
- On the east elevation, the two elements abut rather than interlock. Study that joint a little more.
- The brick that wraps around makes it look like infill.
- There are enough good variation between heights and materials and detailing that it doesn't look like a sandwich.
- I share concerns for the windows in the stair tower, the scale is too small. It may be the symmetrical approach of the windows.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the PUD-GDP for Phase I and Phase II. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided that design issues associated with massing, scaling, height articulation, setback/stepbacks, siting and footprint are subject to further consideration with future PUD-SIP for Phase II.

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of the PUD-SIP for Phase I. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided for the following:

- Utilize taller trees along Campus Drive and look at better interweaving of the spaces with landscaping materials off the east elevation.
- The intersection of the two towers on the east elevation are further studied and resolved with the integration of screening at the top of the building.
- Need to resolve abruptness on how the north tower connects to the stair tower on the east elevation.
- The scale of windows in the stair tower on the east elevation is too small, maybe the symmetrical approach in windows. The proportion of glazing should be studied.
- Add something more than lights in the door on the lower east elevation next to the coffee shop.
- Extend the first floor glazing system for Education and Outreach room to the bottom of the second story element on the north tower of the east elevation.
- Study the entrance elevation on old University Avenue, it appears small; visually make adjoining windows and mullions the same trim as the aluminum door so the entrance is clear with integration between spandrel panels and masonry panels continued to be developed above.
- Resolve issue with the height and screening of stacks, their integration architecturally along with the louver atop the building.
- All architectural modifications shall return for approval.

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 6, 6.5, 7, 7 and 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1552 University Avenue**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating	
<b>Member Ratings</b>	6	7.5	6	-	-	-	7	7	
	7	8	8	7	6	6	8	7	
	6	5	5	-	-	6	6	6	
	8	8	-	-	-	-	9	8	
	6	6	6	7	8	8	7	6.5	

General Comments:

- More coherent architecture with change of material along Old University makes buildings more attractive. Interesting variation of layers, fenestration lowering office portion along Old University successfully addressed neighborhood concerns. Building steps down and respects church much better than earlier iterations. Plan Commission should separate Phase 2 of GDP because bulk and massing will need more study and dialogue with neighborhood.
- Appreciate work to lower office block; excited to see it built.
- Study bringing subtle offset horizontal read above Old University entry. Excellent effort addressing context.
- Resolution of Old University highly successful.