

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: April 17, 2013

TITLE: 6602 Dominion Drive – Amended PD for
Door Creek Church-Phase II. 3rd Ald. Dist.
(29606)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Jay Wendt, Acting Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: April 17, 2013

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Lauren Cnare, Tom DeChant, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 17, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of an Amended PD for Door Creek Church-Phase II located at 6602 Dominion Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Peter Tan, Bill Bauer, Randy Olson and Ryan Quam, all representing Door Creek Church. Tan presented plans for a proposed addition to the church. The proposed site plan shows two entrances for the addition with expanded parking. Bauer addressed the landscape plan with efforts to mimic what was on the original Phase I construction, maintaining the rhythm of trees in the parking lot islands and some additional ornamentals. They are taking this opportunity to install some prairie sod on the terraces to minimize the maintenance.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- You’ve got a great start for the amphitheater area, and I’d like to see the back of it finished off with grading that represents this circle. If you put a backdrop of some type of tree in there, otherwise it falls off so fast that you lose the impact.
- You’re adding 142 stalls? For mostly Saturday night and Sunday usage? You’re adding a lot of pavement. Was your stormwater pond sited for all of this?
 - Parking is not only for weekend usage, the church has daily events.
 - It was designed for all of this. The pond is fairly oversized, and we are going to redirect the storm sewer here and send that to the storm sewer as well.
- You’re uplighting the building? I want to know if those are going to be cut off.
 - The lights are just for this façade. The goal is to light the building, not the sky.
- On the planting plan, I really like the diversity of plants but I have a few concerns. The Butternut, do you think it’s going to do well there?
 - We’re trying to incorporate some diversity.

I would not plant that. The Catalpa which I really like, you’ve got it right along your walkway. I might move it away from the parking lot. The Oaks are going to drop branches and you’ve got them near the

parking lot; I think you're going to have problems. The other thing is that we're really trying to stop having these huge expanses of paved areas and the policy is to have tree islands every 12 stalls. You've got all these stretches of pavement with nothing breaking it up.

- Make the plants play with the building a bit more. There's not enough relationship between the building and the landscaping.
- The Chair noted that landscape bays at 7-feet wide are also acceptable per the code requirements.
- I recommend placing the island adjacent to the walkway, and if you do rely on having more than the 12 and use that median strip use major trees. It's about the shade.
- Is your new east entrance into the atrium accessible?
 - Absolutely.

You may want to study how the existing accessible parking, how their new route will now be taken to get to the atrium. It's a little hard to tell from the plans. Just the sense of entry that you're giving to everyone equitably.

ACTION:

On a motion by Cnare, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0). The motion included the option to either follow the 12 stall island rule or convert the parking lot trees to canopy trees, and that the amphitheater be made more "complete."

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 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 6602 Dominion Drive

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	6	6	6/7	-	-	6	6	6
	6	7	6	6	-	6	7	7
	5	5	6	5	-	6	5	5.5

General Comments:

- Uninspiring and sprawling attempt to mimic Prairie School theme.