

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: March 17, 2010

TITLE: 4622 Dutch Mill Road – Demolition and
New Construction of an Office Building in
UDD No. 1. 16th Ald. Dist. (17628)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: March 17, 2010

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Jay Ferm, Mark Smith, Todd Barnett, Richard Wagner.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 17, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a demolition and new construction located at 4622 Dutch Mill Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Ald. Judy Compton, Steven R. Ring, Robert W. Gile, Steve Lawrence and Joe Ellis, representing the VFW Department of Wisconsin. Ring provided details with the construction of a new office building for the VFW to replace an existing structure on the site which is to be recycled as much as possible following its demolition. He provided a review of the building materials, colors and site plan details including signage, noting the building’s construction with Nichiha siding on three sides, the rear of the building featuring the use of architectural metal panels. The front façade of the building features an over-extended roof projection underlying slanted pole supports. Ring further noted that the site plan features extensive pavement for the building in order to work with its elderly veteran clientele that utilize the facility. Following the presentation Ald. Compton spoke in support of the project, as well as its previous reiterations that have evolved a long way to the project as currently proposed. She further noted the utilization of front yard parking despite its inconsistencies with the requirements for Urban Design District No. 1. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- The lighting fixtures are very large. Their physical size and location are close to the head of the openings. Crowd openings; too large, look at ways to incorporate into soffits and alternative areas, too large, for use associated with loading docks.
- Use of large flat Nichiha panels around the door disproportional to the rest of the brick building. Also, look at strut details that support extended roof projection, chance of someone knocking into them because of their angle, need something at base to prompt user to avoid.
- Consider double glass panel doors at entry or framed single operable with stationary panel to do the same size and scale for balance.
- Question the need for a 30+ foot depth for back-up space.
- Need to really boost the plantings, need more trees and a pedestrian planting scheme. Change burning bush and viburnum, they have clashing fall color and create a more interesting design at less of a cost.
- Evergreen plantings beneath viburnums necessary; one will shade out the other.

- An awful lot of extra pavement, shorten pavement at southeast corner to replace with aggregate not pavement to facilitate the vehicular movement and provide a more pervious surface.
- Have an 8-foot strip not a 5-foot strip with the accessible stall. Eliminate a stall for a sidewalk for the ceremonial area.
- Provide an 8-foot access strip with accessible stall.
- Replace pavement or aggregate where possible in order to accommodate covert vehicular movement associated with accessible needs.
- Question the radius edge of parking, replace with a hammerhead along the easterly lot line and reduce the amount of pavement.
- Relevant to the overhang on the majority of the building, should treat all four sides the same or treat sides the same as the back with the underside soffit to be "a terra cotta color," support canopy comments, provide a change in material to metal panel on the backside to wrap around the corners.
- Trees along the south side to shade building and along front to screen parking; should exceed the point value 2-3 times of the Zoning Code based on the site's location with an Urban Design District.
- Light fixture at the corner of building provides for a lot of glare. Also not shown on renderings. Prefer uplighting at the base for the flagpole fixture.
- Problem with the building's relationship to the road in Urban Design District No. 1. It is required that parking be to the side or the rear, need to do frame building up to road, especially since it serves a public purpose and to have a stronger presence on the road. The building is nice but question if sign is visible enough from road.
- Building design is good but problem with placement on site.
- Lighting fixtures are too industrial, too large, look at where it is; look at soffit lighting for entry and wall signage.
- Need to provide more site context with presentation as required.
- Look at recently approved projects in Urban Design District No. 1 that conform to providing parking to the side or rear.
- Look at placing building parallel to street to widen area to place more parking parallel to the front of the building to replace the excessive amount of pervious area required to accommodate the number of stalls.
- Bring entry façade out with the change in materials.
- Look at alternatives to handling some stormwater on-site, rain garden and flagpole, etc.
- Like building but relationship to street needs to be reexamined and need to show why you need to do what is proposed.
- Need to provide context information to justify site planning issues.

ACTION:

On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion for referral required address of the above stated concerns with further consideration of the project.

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, 5, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 4622 Dutch Mill Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	3	6	5	4	5	4	-	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	5	6	4	5	5	5	5	5
	5	5	4	-	-	6	-	-
	4	7	5	5	6	5	5	5

General Comments:

- Site design features extensive re-thinking.
- Comfortable building but not in compliance with UDD No. 1. More context would help justify.
- Limit amount of asphalt by incorporating aggregate at edges (becomes a "warning strip"). Align 8-foot access zone with entry with 8-foot handicapped stall to west. Keep handicapped sign a safe distance from pedestrians.
- Building needs to relate better to street.
- Not quite there yet. Excellent start.

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: April 7, 2010
TITLE: 4622 Dutch Mill Road – Demolition and New Construction of an Office Building in UDD No. 1. 16 th Ald. Dist. (17628)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: April 7, 2010	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 7, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of demolition and new construction located at 4622 Dutch Mill Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Wilfred Johnson, Joe Ellis, Robert W. Gile, all representing the VFW; and Steven R. Ring, representing All Construction & Design, Inc. Ring began by detailing recent modifications to the plan to address the Commission’s previous comments on the project as outlined within a cover letter within the application packet. The presentation provided for review of site context photographs, along with the following:

- Use of a light gray colored soffit as a desired preference to the suggested terra cotta colored soffit.
- A four-inch bump-out at the main entry with siding to be turned around the backside corners.
- The addition of paired doors at the front.
- The utilization of a consistent overhang on the sides and rear of the building.
- Further explanation and detailing of granite pole supports for the extended roof canopy, noting adequate clearances provided to diminish their potential as unintended obstructions.
- The addition of a stormwater detention pond at the rear, along with significant modifications to the landscape plan to provide for trees and additional plantings in response to the Commission’s previously reviewed comments.

The packet also included a request to maintain consideration of the original site plan as proposed, at the same time provided for an alternative site plan, moved the building forward towards the front lot line and easterly toward the side lot line adjoining the driveway on the adjacent site, which did not accommodate the adjacent neighboring heavy equipment company (Miller-Bradford and Risberg, Inc.). Ring distributed a letter from Steven Jensen, manager of Miller-Bradford and Risberg, Inc. noting the preference for the original plan and opposition to the option which places the building adjacent to their driveway entry. Ring noted that it was preferred to maintain the original site plan as approved with the parking in front and the building to the rear to not obstruct the driveway to the east and be consistent with the development pattern on the adjacent lot to the east, as well as the currently vacant lot to the west (the site of a demolished hotel). Staff noted that the site to the west would be required to provide for formal Urban Design Commission approval upon its redevelopment.

Following the presentation, Wagner thanked the applicants and architect for their patience and effort to address the Commission's concerns. Discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- Relevant to the building rotation with the alternate option, the example validates that the building could be set closer to the street. The original version would be precedent-setting in Urban Design District No. 1; based on previous approvals and ordinance provisions. The original version was problematic, a suburban solution that provides no access from sidewalk to street and requires crossing a parking lot.
- Provides no address of request to reduce impervious areas.
- Return of materials on the corner to the back side of the building should be 5'-6', would support initial if building is rotated.
- Support by Ald. Compton on the original version was noted as communicated in an email to the Commission.
- Question the loss of 40-foot plus trees lost to site development. In addition, question the size of proposed trees, should be a minimum of 2 ½" in caliper.
- Question what happens to the existing shared drive with the property to the west. Question how much more logical to maintain rather than provide for the new driveway as proposed.
- Appreciate change to light fixtures. It was noted that the change through a flagpole light at its base and the use of soffit lighting was appreciated.
- Consider adding a transom above paired doors to enliven entry.
- Conceptually support moving to the street but no gain of anything by moving to the street based on context.
- Resolve issue with proposed drive and maintenance of existing drive to the west with the City Traffic Engineer.

Following a motion by Wagner, seconded by Luskin, to grant final approval, discussion was as follows:

- Alternate site plan places more parking closer to building and provides more safety.
- The orientation on the alternate site plan is more successful relevant to pedestrian access and safety, where the original version sets a precedent in Urban Design District No. 1 and could support alternate site plan.
- Three-inch caliper trees minimum but decry the loss of existing trees due to pre-development site clearing.
- Appreciate improvements but in Urban Design District No. 1 requires address of street where the original version is precedent-setting or alternate version provides better orientation for both automobile and pedestrian access.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Smith, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the project based on the alternate site plan as presented with further consideration of the project requiring a full landscape plan to come back, plus pedestrian access to the public sidewalk, resolve driveway access issues, along with the architecture modified to work with the alternate building siting. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with Wagner and Luskin voting no. A previous motion by Wagner, seconded by Luskin, for final approval noted that in light of existing context, aldermanic support, neighbor issues, combined with improvements to the project over the previous original version merited approval. That motion failed on a vote of (2-6) with Wagner and Luskin voting in favor; and with Rummel, Smith, O'Kroley, Barnett, Slayton and Harrington voting no.

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, 5, 6, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 4622 Dutch Mill Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	4	5	3	-	-	4	-	-
	5	6	5	5	-	5	5	5
	6	7	5	3	-	6	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	6	6	6	6	-	-	6	6
	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
	5 (original) 6 (alternate)	5	5	-	-	4 (original) 6 (alternate)	4/6	5

General Comments:

- Disappointing to see 40" trees removed that could have been designed around.
- Support new use but request applicant comply with UDD No. 1 and reorient to street per the "alternate site plan."
- Appreciate revised site plan.
- Thank you for all of the effort – good project.
- Reorientation seems to offer a safer parking lot. Considering the amount of open space the building would seem to deter from the view to the neighboring property only from a limited angle. Study connecting sidewalk to public walk to encourage future walkability.

Stouder, Heather

From: JoAnn McGuire [jm1spencer@embarqmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2010 1:15 PM
To: Stouder, Heather
Subject: Re: 4622 Dutch Mill Rd. (with attachment)

hi i do not like the exterior of the building,or the roof extension.i think we need to spruce up dutch mill rd..my land will soon be taxed to the point where a mobile home park will be phased out.i have been here for 35 years,so lets set a possive start to the turn over of dutch mill rd.please sumit my feelings to the plam commison. joann

----- Original Message -----

From: Stouder, Heather
To: 'jm1spencer@embarqmail.com'
Cc: Compton, Judy
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2010 1:59 PM
Subject: FW: 4622 Dutch Mill Rd. (with attachment)

Hi JoAnn-

First, the Alder for your district (16) is Judy Compton, and I'm including her on this e-mail. She can be reached at: district16@cityofmadison.com or (608) 221-2567.

Here are the answers to your questions, as the building has been proposed:

Building Footprint: 2,400 sq. ft.

Building Height: Approximately 15' at highest point in front, sloping down to 12' at rear

Exterior Materials (Front and sides): fiber cement shakes. (The applicant included a reference to this website for examples: <http://www.nichiha.com/>)

Exterior Materials (Rear): colored metal panels

If you have any written comments you would like for me to share with the Plan Commission regarding this proposal, please feel free to e-mail them to me by next Wednesday, May 5, and I'll be sure to distribute them prior to their May 10 meeting.

Best-

Heather Stouder

Heather Stouder, AICP

Planner, Planning Division
City of Madison Department of Planning &
Community & Economic Development
P: 608-266-5974
F: 608-267-8739
hstouder@cityofmadison.com

Madison Municipal Building, Ste. LL-100
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
PO Box 2985
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-2985