

AGENDA # 10

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: December 6, 2006

TITLE: 9701 Brader Way – PUD(SIP), Office Building. 9th Ald. Dist. (04545)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: December 6, 2006

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 6, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(SIP) located at 9701 Brader Way. Appearing on behalf of the project were Alex King, Keith Kaetterhenry, Tom Knoop, Jeremy Homstadt and Ross Menard. In response to the Commission’s previous review of the project at its meeting of October 27, 2006 both the site and building plans have been revised with the applicant providing an overview of the modifications based on an outline of issues provided within the application packet.

- To address concerns requiring the building to address the street and to provide prominent entries (dedicated) an architecturally prominent entry has been provided on Brader Way, including a canopy, large landscape planters, benches, patterned entry pavement that extends into the public walk and incorporating recessed double glass doors. In addition, an 8-foot wide stairway up to an 18-foot deep patio has been provided off of Veritas Drive where the patio may be utilized as an employee break area with tables and chairs. In addition, metal awnings have been provided over the first floor windows along Veritas and Brader Way to provide further fenestration of the first floor level at the street.
- In response to a request to consider the use of opaque glass to conceal the floor to ceiling areas, the applicant maintained its use but provided further enhancement with the introduction of awnings over the first floor window to reduce the visibility of the spandrel at that level.
- Requests to modify the landscape plan was accommodated with the incorporation of shade trees as a replacement for crab trees, along with additional screening around the perimeter of the surface parking area and entrance to underground parking.
- A request to look at different treatment of glazing on various elevations was addressed with modifications as shown on perspective renderings within the submittal packet.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Concerns with the height of the fascia still being out of proportion with the base and the rest of the building were noted with the applicant emphasizing its function to screen mechanicals.
- The CMU above the base needs to be smooth masonry material.
- Staff noted the need to provide a building material and color reference details for the various elevations.

- Still an issue with the amount of parking and impervious area.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Ald. Radomski, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1-1) with Barrett voting no and Geer abstaining. The motion for final approval required that the applicant make sure the planters stay large at the entry off of Brader Way and the raised patio area on Veritas Drive. In addition, relevant to the overhangs as shown in elevation, the applicant had the latitude to make them deeper with smooth face masonry to be utilized as a replacement for split face masonry and with the elevations to be modified to show the patio doors.

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, 7, 7, 7 and 8.

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	-	7	-	-	-	-	-	7
	5	6	7	7	-	5	6	6
	8	8	9	8	-	7	7	8
	6	7	8	8	-	7	7	7
	7	7	7	7	-	7	7	7
	2	5	-	-	-	-	2	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6

General Comments:

- Much improved.
- Much improved.
- Good improvements, thanks for your cooperation.
- The entry treatments are a major improvement, as is the lighter window tint. The overall site plan fails because it does not follow the promise of drastically reduced parking through shared parking arrangements with the church.
- Overhang at east/west sides – provide both sides for solar (west critical) top band (fascia) way to heavy.