

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: January 20, 2010
TITLE: 7102 U.S. Highway 12/18 – PUD – Dane County Waste Transfer Station. 16 th Ald. Dist. (17126)	REFERRED:
	REREFERRED:
	REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: January 20, 2010	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Dawn Weber, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Jay Ferm, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, Richard Slayton and Mark Smith.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 20, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of an Amended PUD/GDP-SIP located at 7102 U.S. Highway 12/18 for a waste transfer station. Appearing on behalf of the project was Ald. Judy Compton. Registered and speaking in support was John Welch, Recycling Manager/Project Manager, Dane County Public Works; John Kannall, Susan Bocker, and James Hansen, all with Graef-USA. Prior to the presentation, staff noted that the project involves the development of a new waste transfer station at the current Dane County Rodefild Landfill, in order to divert recycling materials from the way stream that is disposed of in the landfill. According to Welch, diverting recycling materials to recycle markets will extend the life of the landfill, increase recycling rates and reduce dependence on raw materials from manufacturing. Welch and the design team, presented details for the development of the two building components, two level transfer station facility. Staff noted that the scope of the review should emphasize the building and site views as it applies to the new facility. The detailed review of the plans emphasize the setback and views from adjacent roads, especially Highway 12 & 18. It was further noted that the facility was designed to deal with a 100-year storm water event. Following the presentation of the plans, Ald. Compton noted her support for the project and the need for as much improvements to the building as possible due to the proximity to the future juncture of the Stoughton Road connector. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Appreciate the use of translucent panels on the upper elevation of the building, look at opportunities to provide more daylighting and need to see samples.
- Look at overhangs and pattern of windows. In addition, question the color of the building, look at it beyond another beige box.
- Consider providing outdoor seating for employees.
- Either plant screening to protect views from Highway 12 & 18 or let existing vegetation provide for the screening, but screen from highway.
- Under the drop off canopy, make separate lanes/islands within the drop off area.
- Screen from road utilizing something beyond evergreens.
- Provide architectural enhanced features of the building, but don't hide building.
- Look at maximizing daylight.

- Need wayfinding plan to direct citizens to the hazardous waste drop off area.
- Consider having the various building components be different colors.
- Consider the use of different colored doors beyond white. Work with the color pallet of the building and provide vertical breaks in the façade.
- This is an opportunity to provide for view gallery as an educational tool.
- The product exchange door should have a retail appearance.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion required address of comments relative to architecture, landscaping, building color, the various screening options, day lighting, in addition to providing site and building lighting information, as well as material colors and samples.

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, 5, 8, 5 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 7102 US Highway 12/18

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings		5				6	7	6
	6	6	4					
								5
	5	5	2			3	Not urban	
								8
	5	5	5				?	5
	6	6	5					6

General Comments:

- Need to see landscape plan. Add color, wayfinding/signage to make it a more interesting facility.
- Functionally an excellent building, use metal, glass? Concrete in large scale architectural gestures.
- Clarify public vs. private green.
- Step building section to take advantage of lake views. I want to be inspired by the architecture. Stair width seems adequate for existing conditions. Craft plan for site – make narrower to provide some minimal setback. DNR setback, pier – need answer. “Village Green” now seems too fragmented – prefer simple lawn approach.
- Necessary project appropriately miserable. Building design – really? More trees along 12/18.
- Good use!