

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: October 7, 2009
TITLE: 3322 Agriculture Drive - Four Building Addition to the Danisco USA, Inc. Facility in Urban Design District No.1. 16th Ald. Dist. (15916)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: October 7, 2009	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Ron Luskin*, Richard Wagner and Jay Ferm.

*Luskin arrived at 5:45 p.m.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 7, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of four building additions located at 3322 Agriculture Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Rad Hawkos, Gene A. Bohn and Jim Ternus, all representing Danisco; and Brendon Kress, representing Strand Associates. The modified plans as presented feature the following:

- A revised landscape plan for the southerly parking lot with an addition of two tree islands, the introduction of shade trees at the street, along with a double row of trees on its westerly boundary adjacent to an existing surface parking lot, with the overall landscape plan emphasizing screening on three sides.
- The north and northeasterly parking lots have been designed to retain existing canopy trees, with tree islands featuring the addition of canopy trees as well as along the perimeter of the northeasterly parking lot.
- The north loading area features enhanced landscaping at its entry, as well as additional screening utilizing both existing and proposed vegetation adjacent to its proximity to Femrite Drive. A request to consider “no mow areas” in close proximity to both existing and expanded facilities could not be met due to restrictions in having vegetation within 75-feet of a doorway as required under regulatory restrictions.
- The landscape plan palette emphasizes native plantings.
- The building elevations feature a regrouping and rearrangement of windows on precast panels with the elimination of windows on the west side, in addition the diamond designs featured on insulated precast panels have been eliminated.
- Rooftop equipment noted to be enclosed and screened on the proposed additions.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Add sidewalk along Femrite Drive; encourage with this phasing.
- Encourage Danisco to do a TDM plan to reduce parking.

- Disappointed with the loss of window openings on the west side. Could use tinted glass to deal with solar gain on small sized windows. The left-hand side of the west full side elevation, as well as the right-hand side should be amended to continue the rhythm of windows around the building as previously proposed. The windows shall be recessed or provided with a blade to deal with solar gain or use tinted glazing.
- Move trees within the tree islands in both the northeasterly and southerly parking lots away from the drive aisle to be more centered within the tree islands.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0-1) with Luskin abstaining. The motion required the reintroduction of windows as previously proposed with filtering sunlight with glazing, recessing or blade as suggested, along with adjustment to canopy trees and tree islands within both the northeasterly and southerly parking lots away from the drive aisle to be centered, in addition to the encouragement of providing sidewalks within the public right-of-way with this phase of development.

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, 5.5, 6, 6, 6.5 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 3322 Agriculture Drive

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	7	6	5	6	-	5	6	6
	6	6	5	5	-	5	-	5
	6	6	8/	6	-	7	5	7
	5	5	5	-	-	4	-	5
	5	6	6	5	-	6	6	5.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.5

General Comments:

- Applicant very responsive to aesthetic concerns. Much appreciated.
- Functional, but little more.