

## AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> December 7, 2011
TITLE: 402 South Point Road – Public Building. 9 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (24671)	<b>REFERRED:</b>
	<b>REREFERRED:</b>
	<b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: December 7, 2011	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, and John Harrington.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of December 7, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a public building located at 402 South Point Road. Appearing on behalf of the project was Brad Werkins and Katie Udell, with Angus Young Associates, representing the City of Madison Streets Department. Werkins presented plans for a new storage facility for the City of Madison Streets Department. The project is a little over 21,000 square feet for Warm Storage building. The site is located on the west side off the Beltline adjacent to the Fire Station No. 12. The land is currently zoned Industrial and has stormwater management plans in place for that purpose. The new facility would be adjacent to the existing salt storage shed. Images were shown of the surrounding area. Drainage runs generally from northeast to southwest towards the salt storage facility; low lying areas were created when these were put in that include a retention and infiltration pond on adjacent properties with an onsite stormwater pond proposed immediately adjacent to the salt storage building. An endangered species report was done that showed no issues. The master planning was done to provide optimal location for this Warm Storage building. Gas and sanitary would be from South Point, hydrants will be installed in at least two locations. Depending on the wetland delineation the pond may be smaller than shown and they are planning a bioretention area. Cut-off lighting fixtures are proposed for mounting on the building. Colorado Spruce are also planned as part of the landscaping. Precast stone, metal siding and a standing seam roof are all proposed. Alternatives for a mezzanine and wash bay were shown. Color options include forest green with beige, or colors taken off the Fire Station with mahogany tones and white trim.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Has this master plan been approved?
  - With the information we have at this time, it’s not for your approval it’s to provide guidance on the optimal location for this storage building.

Staff noted that historically this was supposed to be a shared County and City facility for public works that never transpired. Based on this the conceptual master plan that was developed when the property was annexed is no longer viable; the Commission has never seen a master plan for this until now. If we’re approving a building and we know other buildings are coming it’s difficult to not comment on the overall site plan without approval and review of the master plan, which does require the Urban Design Commission’s review by

ordinance as a “public project.” In our charge in review of public projects, “...major alteration to new existing public buildings and their related spaces...” is required. Wagner noted that based on his recollection the Commission at the time never reviewed the master plan, but how this property would be used as plans developed. It’s hard to separate this as something that doesn’t need to be reviewed. I recollect part of the budget procedure was to determine where these functional services should be. There is some talk about that. But the site plan itself we want to develop as a concept to fill in the site to see what can fit on the site. We put the other things to show how potentially this could work.

- I want to know what’s already determined, what else is being planned. To me it doesn’t look as if there’s limited sharing of pavement. It looks very random as opposed to organized and making good use of space. It may very well be a good plan but until it’s vetted by the designer I’m not comfortable with it. I’m reluctant to make any comments until we can review the site plan.
- Are you prepared to talk about the master plan?
- Plan is too random with placement of structures and uses.
- I look at this and I see...what’s going on on the east side? How do they enter? One of the nice things the fire station does is address the street nicely. How the vehicle storage building and fleet services are positioned relative to South Point is going to affect the positioning of this storage building. Is there a way to make that less visible from the neighborhood to the southwest? Eliminate some of the arterials around the site? It just seems like it’s a little bit too random at this point.
- Need more context with surrounding area including existing and proposed land use. Need to confirm proposed land uses to be developed as part of the master plan; need more information on evolution of master plan.
- Need to provide way to reduce pavement, provide pavement efficiency.
- Need to look at better/City sustainability issues and need with project.
- There was a fence to go all the way around this. Once you wrap a fence around it that site is self-contained. Why aren’t the roads be shared and find another way to introduce your security measures and add more greenspace.
- If this was a new commercial building we would not be excited about having the parking lot on the street.
- Does the City need two police training areas on two sides of the City?
  - It would also be incorporated with large vehicle training for Metro. For larger maneuvers. I don’t think police training is what they are looking at for out here.
- I think it is a bigger sustainability issue in how the City is looking to develop green fields and deteriorating already built environments. This seems to be a bigger discussion about need.
- I don’t mind metal buildings. That being said, this is out in the country and it would be interesting if some of the forms could have gone with what would have been there. No objection to the metal siding, but if I look at the south elevation with only one door, it seems like that door should be more visible, there should be some articulation to protect the overhang, I don’t think the way the base is handled is quite right. The shirt doesn’t work with the skirt. The windows, I’m glad to see you’re thinking about daylighting, they just look a little uninspired.
- My concerns are greater than the detail of the building and apply to the need to develop a more functional and accurate master plan.
- It looks like you’ve got about 1-foot between the pavement and the fence; move it back from pavement, plow will take it out. Square it off where you can and put more landscaping details in. I would introduce more of a variety in your tree species. The Spruce trees, I’d try to get them wrapped so it looks more like a grove than a line. Try to get more organic with your plantings.

- The stormwater, the potential area for wetlands, make the pond look like it relates to the wetlands. I'm concerned with the salt so close to the wetlands. In a flood situation what happens? Around the Warm Storage building area, integrate stormwater pond with delineated wetland with a more organic shape.
- A more functional and accurate master plan.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item to address the above stated concerns with the need to reexamine the master plan for what projected programming is actually planned to be on the site. Look at an overall design that minimizes pavement and provides for shared parking, especially with the driver training area. In addition, provide more information on what's happening to the east and relate to the fire station and stormwater facility and make main drive like an urban streetscape. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0).

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 4, 4 and 5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 402 South Point Road**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	4	4	3	-	-	-	-	-
	4	6	-	-	-	-	4	5
	4	3.5	-	-	-	4	4	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4

General Comments:

- Site plan has too much pavement, needs rethinking. Larger policy questions raise concerns about best design for site. Architectural generally OK.
- Begin with master plan.
- Better site to master plan integration is required.