

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: June 28, 2006

TITLE: 700 University Avenue – Amended
PUD(GDP-SIP), Modifications to
Previously Approved Elevations for a
Mixed-Use Development (University
Square). 8th Ald. Dist. (02772)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: June 28, 2006

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 28, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of an amended PUD(GDP-SIP), modifications to previously approved elevations for a mixed-use development, University Square. Appearing on behalf of the project were Greg Rice, Eric Lawson, Rick Gilbertsen, Mark Bastian and Susan Springman. Prior to the presentation, staff noted to the Commission that the requested alterations to the approved and recorded plans relative to the building elevations were the limits of the Commission's review; other portions of the elevations outside of these areas may have been the subject of other required modifications following the Commission's previous review of the project in granting final approval. A presentation of the before and after elevational changes were provided that primarily consisted of changes from the use of precast to brick panels (vertically oriented), the introduction of more glass and balconies with the balconies moved and reoriented on different elevations based on interior segmentation changes. It was also noted that the interior ceiling height at each floor level was increased by four inches per floor, resulting in a net increase in building height; still below the Capitol View Limits. The modified vertical panel columns are precast brick; real brick cast and precast panels. Following the presentation of the plans, the Commission noted the following:

- There appears to be changes to the lower levels of certain elevations not previously presented to the Commission. Staff noted to the Commission that these changes were requirements following their final approval of the project established by certain reviewing agencies comments, as well as input at both the Plan Commission and Common Council approval levels. Staff noted that the features on the lower level were part of the approved and recorded PUD-SIP plans and not within the scope of the Commission's current review of proposed modifications.
- The overall concept of strong vertical elements from top to bottom is better, where this is a change to transparent vertical strips from their previous solid appearance.
- The Lake Street elevation appears to have the most elevational changes; attempts to reduce the dorm-like appearance.

- Like the addition of brick precast panels to replace precast vertical elements; more fully developed on Lake Street than the previous elevations to make it more comparable with other elevations. Like material change.
- Appears that vertical elements are hung off; problem with how it is handled in terms that it is more superficial.
- The modifications provide that the building appears less industrial and institutional.
- The modifications provide for more continuity with this solution for a complex building.

ACTION:

On a motion by March, seconded by Geer, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-1-1) with Barnett voting no and Ald. Radomski abstaining.

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 5, 5, 6, 6.5 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 700 University Avenue

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

General Comments:

- A little bit of improvements – architects should review and discuss architecture, not developers that cannot answer our questions.
- No objection to additional glass, brick. It is the details that are worrisome.
- Like the addition of brick in lieu of precast panels.
- Changes are relatively neutral, overall.
- Does look less “institutional.”