

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: June 20, 2007
TITLE: 34 Schroeder Court – New Construction – Office Building in UDD No. 2. 1 st Ald. Dist. (06638)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: June 20, 2007	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Lou Host-Jablonski, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Michael Barrett and Richard Slayton.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 20, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for new construction of an office building located at 34 Schroeder Court. Appearing on behalf of the project was Ray Rodenbeck. Wagner abstained from consideration of this item. Prior to the presentation, staff noted to the Commission that the hearing of this project is to be deferred due to the absence of corresponding required application for Plan Commission approval for the demolition of the existing building on the site. Under the Urban Design Commission/Plan Commission policy Plan Commission application is required to be submitted in order to provide for formal consideration of the project by the Urban Design Commission thus a deferral of the public hearing for approval of the project was required to be delayed. Rodenbeck then presented details for the development of a three-story office building with floor-level parking approximately 54,000 square feet in size proposed with the demolition of the existing one-story on the site. The new building will be all masonry with an aluminum glazing system with metal HVAC rooftop screening. Following Rodenbeck's presentation site plan and building elevation details; he noted that additional information would be provided upon return for formal consideration. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- An issue with the closeness of parking to the building, Rodenbeck noted that it was due to the 30-foot fire access lane, but alterations were possible to provide for an adjustment.
- When questioned about safe access to loading area, Rodenbeck noted that a stripe tab would be provided.
- An issue with the preservation of existing trees, Rodenbeck noted was as a result of the parking layout precluding the maintenance of existing trees on the site.
- In regards to building placement, look at alternatives to the south or the west.
- Issues were raised with the lack of contextual information relevant to the development site and surrounding properties.
- It's questioned as to whether or not the building will feature spandrel vs. glazing glass in order to accommodate surgical floor. It was noted by Rodenbeck that the operation area will be internal, therefore, no need to provide for spandrel.

- An issue was raised with the straight unalignment of the access drive/entry to the ramp: consider bringing ramp entry to the east and eliminate west entry for additional landscape area.
- Issue with the landscape plan, where the Urban Design Commission normally requires double the minimum points. In addition screen heavily between parking and adjoining property lines including the provision of new landscape points, calculations.
- Provide more canopy trees in upper parking lot.
- Consider more structured parking beneath the building. Adjustments to that proposed surface parking on the east to provide for more green space in easterly surface parking.
- Concerned with north elevation facing highway and how signage will work. The building doesn't have a lot of architecture going on, needs more.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION**, no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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, 4 and 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
Member Ratings	5	4/5	5	-	-	5	-	5
	-	4	4	-	-	-	-	4
	3	5	3	4	-	4	3	4

General Comments:

- Provide greater species diversity (especially major trees).
- The architecture needs some work yet. There's too little architecture happening here. There's also too much impervious surface area, and too little landscaping.
- Parking is a predominant feature of this site, this should be mitigated by saving the established trees.
- Look at reducing impervious areas, building entry.