

AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: June 6, 2012

TITLE: 402 South Point Road – Public Building,
Streets Department Warm Storage
Building and West Side Public Works
Master Plan. 9th Ald. Dist. (24671)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: June 6, 2012

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 6, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a public building located at 402 South Point Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Katie Udell and Jeffrey Hazekamp, representing Angus Young Associates; Chris Kelley, Streets Superintendent; Max Conway and Randall S. Wiesner, both representing City Streets and City Engineering. Udell presented the site plan for a new 21,280 square foot storage building on the existing South Point Public Works facility site. Three wetland areas have been delineated with drainage flowing from the northeast to the southwest. The two drives have been decreased to one drive. With this project they are proposing placing certain trees along the drive and the berm, some of which will be replanted. A total of 80 parking spaces will be included. The reason for proposing the looped drive provides access for developing the other sites for City uses, and having direct access to them. For a Public Works operation, this type of drive is easier and safer for the larger equipment. The “warm storage” building is being proposed first in the development area because of the overcrowding at the Badger Road facility, as well as for maintaining equipment and storing it inside rather than outside. The Secretary asked them to discuss the West Side Public Works Master Plan, as well as the stormwater management plans. Conway presented the stormwater management plans that address run-off, infiltration, and 80% sediment control around the site. Two ponds are included that will provide the detention required on the site. Four rain garden areas are set up around the site for infiltration.

- I had asked you to study why this is being proposed for this location in a green field rather than in a more centrally located industrial area.
 - This was originally intended to go on Badger Road but the site there is basically full and the trucks and equipment to be served by this building is mostly serving the west side of the community. The reason this land was acquired in the 1990s was for a public works site to serve the west side of the City.
- I don’t know how the watershed comes into this site. I would like to see how stormwater is going to come here from off the site.

- The north and northwest boundary lines is a ditch and stormwater sewer coming from the north around the west to the regional ponds that were initially planned long before the Cardinal Glen residential area was planned.
- Are you doing landscaping around these ponds.
 - I don't know.
- Is there a possibility you could play with those ponds, the distances and edges, to make them feel like a more natural pond setting?

A motion was made by O'Kroley, seconded by Rummel, to **REFER** this for further study. Discussion on the motion centered on the Master Plan rather than the "Warm Storage" building itself. O'Kroley remarked that there was a previous request for more information on the neighborhood plan and a Public Works Master Plan and information on drainage. Conway noted that the other platted areas developed before this, including light industrial to the west, single-family and multi-family to the east that all have their own facilities that integrate area-wide to deal with stormwater. Staff noted that the request for us to look at the warm storage building comes into play because it is a public building; at the same time we weren't privy to the previous version of the master plan that was developed for this site. The Commission previously requested to see how this relates to other future planning initiatives on the site and other adjacent land uses that exist. Staff commented that this is a site that was chosen and developed for this purpose. The motion was tabled by unanimous consent.

The presentation for the "Warm Storage" building proceeded with Hazekamp presenting plans for a metal building with toilet facilities. It is a single slope for the majority of the building with a lean-to on the side that faces the street. The base material will be a masonry block with siding panel in dark green with a beige colored trim that would also be the color of the overhead doors. The roof slopes away from the street and will also be used for the lean-to in stainless galvanized steel. Clearstory windows have been included to bring in natural light and save on electricity.

The Secretary read comments made from the December 7, 2011 relative to the "Warm Storage" building, which include:

- It would be interesting if some of the forms could have gone with what would have been there.
- Looking at the south elevation with only one door, it seems like the door should be more visible.
- There should be articulation to handle the overhang.
- The shirt doesn't work with the skirt.
- The windows look a bit uninspired.

Hazekamp remarked that the budget for the project may not cover everything they want to do. Rather than scaling everything back they are listing the wash bay, a mezzanine, a canopy and a crane as alternates. The Chair noted that if the Commission approves the plans with the alternates, and they are eventually not included, then the building does not conform to what the Commission had approved. Further comments included the following:

- The decorative aspects of the building are unnecessary.
- The master plan needs to go back and be studied in such a way that pulls the main building to the street.
- Look at how the parking stalls, particularly the one labeled "Future Parking 41" to be less of an intrusion into the greenspace that maybe one can use the existing drive as a backup space.
- Look at simplifying the drive to make a larger greenspace, rather than having three looped areas that spread out across the development.

- The ornamental brackets around the columns should be looked at. Keeping it simple is a good way to go. The columns seem pretty spindly.
- Look at a way to break up these panels with some patterning or vertical element that picks up on the columns. Maybe some cowling on the windows that gives it some enhancement.
- You might look at a different green, it looks a little artificial.
- If this piece of the washing bay is eliminated would there be an entry there?
 - They would have to come back if they don't develop something we approve.
- I'm not concerned about this building in terms of its location and being industrial to store things, but I am concerned about the street side of the building for the people in the future offices that will face that. Either a wall of landscaping, or parking stalls or an entry drive.
- I think the drive and the parking could be rearranged to give a little bit more open space and greenery; make it so not everything is so independent.
- Have your program drive what this building should be.

ACTION:

The **REFERRAL** motion was taken up to include the Master Plan and the comments given. Before a next piece of Public Works activity on any site within the Master Plan area returns to the Commission, the Master Plan should be revised and revisited to address previous and current comments and concerns. The motion passed on unanimous a vote of (7-0).

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Lufler, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** for the Warm Storage building. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0). The motion provided for address of the above stated concerns and the following:

- Any changes to the building following final approval due to budgetary concerns shall return to the Commission.

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, 5, 5 and 5/6.

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
Member Ratings	4	4	-	-	-	5	0	4
	5	4	-	-	-	5	-	5
	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	4
	4	5	-	-	-	4	5	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Building: 6 Plan: 5

General Comments:

- Not clear that site plan related to surrounding Planned Development, especially high density housing.
- Building/site plan are not there yet.
- Master plan: orient people office buildings to street and simplify and reduce parking to extent possible. Building OK.