



Agenda Item #: 3

Project Title: 702-750 University Row & 5119 Silvertree Run - Major Amendment to an Approved Planned Development (PD) for Expansion of UW Digestive Health Clinic in Urban Design District (UDD) 6. (District 19)

Legistar File ID #: 83466

Members Present: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Rafeeq Asad, Jessica Klehr, Russell Knudson, Marsha Rummel, Shane Bernau, and Wendy von Below

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of September 11, 2024, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a major amendment to an approved Planned Development (PD) located at 702-750 University Row & 5119 Silvertree Run. Registered and speaking in support were Neil Densmore, Dietmar Bassuner, Jenni Eschner, and Jen Voigt. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Daniel Singer, and Kathleen Ferrero.

Summary of Commission Discussion and Questions:

The Commission inquired about how metal screening panels on the parking garage meet the ground and what the building base looks like, and what the details of the covered walkway are. The applicant responded that the first-floor precast panel goes up to 40" above grade. The screen panels start at the second-floor datum line and go up to the top of the structure. This allows the elevation to achieve 20% openness for the naturally ventilated structure. The applicant clarified that the covered walkway is a temporary structure that is removable because it crosses a public easement.

The Commission inquired about the different masonry style and materials across the project, including the thin brick and the brick pattern cast into the concrete panels. The applicant clarified that the clinic is traditional masonry to match the existing building, with a thin brick for the parking structure, and a vertical strip on corner of parking structure. The acid etched precast has a vertical pattern, and the left is perforated screening with two patterns.

The Commission inquired about the architectural lighting on the parking structure, especially the upper levels of garage. The applicant responded all lights will be downcast, and levels will be lowered to minimum safety standards after clinic closing. All lights are focused downward and mounted under the solar canopy.

The Commission inquired about the parking structure materials as viewed from the intersection of University Row and University Avenue with the idea of minimizing blank walls, noting that limited information was provided related to this street view.

The Commission noted acceptance of the TOD overlay exceptions being considered.

The Commission discussed the corner element of the parking structure, minimizing blank walls, long views, compatibility with the surrounding context, and sufficiency of the proposed landscape and screening, especially at the street level.

In consideration of a motion and findings, one could say that the ramp could be or is designed such that the material, proportions, and scale of openings in the parking structure are consistent with those of the building, and that the landscaping mitigates the effect of having cars on the street, and consideration of cost and de-watering of the subterranean ramp. With regard to setbacks and driveways, this is a unique situation where people come regionally, it's not just a neighborhood clinic. They need to be dropped off so being able to see that as you approach the building is paramount to a clinic like this.

Commissioner von Below found the materiality and proportions of the garage design problematic given the two corten steel panels which seem foreign to the project and the context. There does not appear to be an architectural conversation between the building addition and the parking structure, which has a more vertical appearance and application of materials. The base has not been developed well and limited information has been provided regarding the base treatment. It almost feels as though the garage entry is more suited in its architectural language to the clinic building with a higher level of detail and not the parking structure itself. Additional detailing is needed on the parking structure, especially as it turns the corner and the covered walkway, which appears thin.

Commissioner Asad did not agree or disagree, noting that it is not the materials, but maybe it is the application of the materials instead. Applying the corten panels in a way that is more complementary way that better corresponds with the horizontality of the building. Commissioner Asad noted that he needed to better understand the ground level, where it appears open but not activated, and being heavily screened with vegetation; that could use some work and seems like an afterthought. The project could use some touchups with some of the datums and how those materials are applied.

Further discussion of the parking structure clarified that the Commission is not averse to the corten material, it is more the application and lack of integration of the material – the panels appear to be just attached to the building wall. The parking structure corner tower elements do not seem to relate as well – they are all different. Looking at the building beyond there is some articulation in the footprint and walls, which should serve as a point of reference for design considerations and refinements.

The Commission note that the corten screens are a nice material that will add interest to the parking structure. The application of the material is repetitious that does not relate to the other building in any way - it has a nice play of verticality; the language isn't matching when they so easily could. A horizontal element or datum could be introduced to parking structure to better relate to the building. The Commission was not convinced this is the best pattern for the screening material.

Commissioner Bernau noted that there is good and robust landscaping proposed. Commissioner Bernau noted that he had been under the impression that there was some topography and berming of the earth to reinforce the planting at the ground level, but that berming is no longer proposed. It would be a stronger landscape edge, base and foreground to the building if there was more topography undulation. A little bit of earth work for that landscape edge would be beneficial. The large blank wall needs plants to anchor that wall better.

Action

On a motion by von Below, seconded by Asad, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**, with the following:

- Overall, the Commission finds that the proposed TOD overlay exceptions are consistent with the Planned Development (PD) standards.
- Overall, the Commission finds that the proposed building addition is consistent with the UDD 6 guidelines and requirements, as well as the PD standards.

- Related to the parking structure, design-related modifications are necessary for the Commission to make findings, including:
 - The applicant shall provide additional architectural detailing, renderings and perspectives of the parking structure, including long views, at grade views, and perspectives of the covered walkway.
 - The applicant shall consider how the materiality is integrated with the language of the proposed new clinic and existing clinic, including the application of the materials, rhythm and proportions. The applicant shall refine the corner tower elements to be consistent in design and material.
 - The landscape plan and grading plans shall be revised to incorporate berming along the public street facing side of the parking structure to support the proposed landscape.
 - The UDC recommends the project return to UDC for Final Approval.

The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0).