

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: October 21, 2015
TITLE: 3401 Maple Grove Drive – Two-Story Addition to St. Mary’s Care Center and Relocation of the Therapy Department. 7 th Ald. Dist. (40312)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: October 21, 2015	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Slayton, Acting Chair; John Harrington, Cliff Goodhart, Michael Rosenblum, Lois Braun-Oddo, Tom DeChant and Dawn O’Kroley.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 21, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a two-story addition to St. Mary’s Care Center and relocation of the therapy department located at 3401 Maple Grove Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Rick Stoughton, Bill Bender and Mike Schaefer, all representing St. Mary’s Care Center.

The proposed 9,952 square foot addition would accommodate relocation of the therapy department and provide a connection between the two buildings. This addition would not provide any more beds, just adequate space. The drive aisle and parking would also be reconfigured. Brick veneer would match the existing building materials. Landscaping would include ornamental grasses and decorative shrubs.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Do you have outpatient therapy as well?
 - We do but it’s a very small amount.
- Do you have space for a possible tree island that could help direct traffic? That could start a hierarchy of circulation.
 - The way the site is laid out, with visitor parking in the front, there’s a loop that comes around and the idea was if an ambulance had to come in and turn around, we sized that for a large vehicle, and at that point the island became almost insignificant.
 - We thought it worked well to have striping and arrows on the pavement versus an island to also accommodate fire trucks.
- How will you get lawn mowing equipment into the courtyard area? And I’d like to see as part of this development some thought given to that courtyard, landscape-wise.
 - There will be landscaping in there. We understood the scope of this review to be more concerned with what we see from outside the building, not internal to the building. We talked about doing a

walking path to enjoy planted greenspace. The lawn mower is a good point and we'll be sure to address that.

- The 45-degree return on your canopy to address the parking edge seems a little bit odd. If you had a rectilinear canopy a person would approach it more like a plaza space rather than that which looks vehicle-oriented but isn't a covered drive.
 - It was meant for a drop-off underneath the canopy.
- It looks like you have enough room in that peninsula for a tree planting.
 - We'd like to preserve the views to the greenspace.
 - We have a roof patio that would really block the view of that tree canopy. We can add trees but maybe in a different spot.

It seems like a lot of pavement for the number of people that will be accessing along there, but there's other reasons for not having the tree there, I understand that.

- I think simplifying the southwest component a little bit might help; treat the front left façade in a similar fashion like the front right façade, simplify the left side.

ACTION:

On a motion by O'Kroley, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided that the applicant simplify the southwest component to the building, to return to staff.