

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

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

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 16, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** on the project as a whole with final conditional approval on the southerly parking lot addition located at 3322 Agriculture Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Brendan Kress, Jim Ternus, Gene A. Bohn and Rod Hawkos, all representing Danisco USA, Inc. Prior to the presentation staff noted that the project provides for four additions to the existing Danisco plant; a type of “industrial” infill within the boundaries of the site. The site itself is located within an area primarily designated for manufacturing concerns. Staff noted that an earlier addition in May of 2007 was approved administratively by staff to the facility. The project provides for four additions to the existing culture plant ranging in size from 3100 square feet to 11,300 square feet in size. The project also provides for modifications to large truck vehicle loading access off of the property’s Femrite Drive frontage as well as new surface parking additions, one to the east of the existing plant, another to the southeast of the existing plant to facilitate the ongoing growth of the facilities. The presentation and request for approvals was structured to provide for the immediate approval of the southerly parking addition with a request for initial approval of the four additions in line with modifications to the northerly loading and truck access area and proposed east parking facility and further consideration at a future meeting of the Urban Design Commission. Details of existing facilities, including parking and loading areas, were provided in conjunction with the proposed addition, surface parking lot expansions and truck loading facilities. The need to provide for the immediate approval of the southerly parking lot was to allow for flexibility in addressing on-site parking needs with construction of the four additions as well as a redo of the truck queuing and backup circulation from a gated entry point. It was further noted that final details relevant to signage and screened fencing will be provided following final approval of the four building additions, the easterly surface parking lot and northerly loading area. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Relative to landscaping, lose stalls in the southerly parking lot in order to meet the 12 stall/tree island interval where tree islands would be provided in the middle of each side across from each other.
- The planting pallet is serviceable, but can be made more native. In addition to modifying the overall plan to emphasize more shade and canopy trees.
- Use smooth face block on the buildings.
- Use American Viburnum rather than European Viburnum.

- Use large canopy trees in parking lot, not green spire and add canopy trees along the westerly sides of both parking lots and use more spreading tree varieties rather than columnar.
- Thorough packet; complete.
- Question the use of t-shaped pavement at east for fire access; check with Fire to make sure northerly area doesn't work to offset or reduce to offset. Reduce if necessary.
- Consider color and differential pavement patterns within the surface parking lot.
- Question making parking and pavement less of a feature.
- On Femrite Drive concern with screening and industrial development. Is it adequate; might do more to screen out with landscaping.
- Concern with future development of parking lot on the corner; need to have building that is brought out to the corner.
- Make combined tree island and walkway to the existing westerly parking area adjacent to the southerly parking lot addition.
- Screen mechanicals on elevations facing Femrite Drive.
- Consider bringing wetland motif to developed area of the site.
- Mass of building – don't treat each precast panel the same with windows, but group windows together on certain panels and look at depth for solar shading.
- Don't want to see screening that mutes seeing what's behind it, but soften down using double rows of trees to screen facility, but don't want to see solid screen.
- Landscaping should be at least twice as much as minimally required. Cut down on maintained lawn on site in addition to consideration for rain garden areas.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion provided for initial approval on the south parking lot to include additional tree islands at an interval of 12 stalls, a redo of the landscape plan and favor the use of more canopy trees rather than a solid screen. Canopy trees should be provided along the southerly parking lot's easterly side as well as a double row of canopy trees along its westerly side adjacent to existing surface parking. Canopy trees shall be shade trees. In addition the use of "no mow" grasses are required to be utilized in favor of formal lawn as much as possible. Future consideration shall provide for a reexamination of the fire access on the northerly portion of the site to reduce pavement in addition to the grouping of windows and precast panels as well as future separate consideration of permanent screening and signage.

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, 6, 6, 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	6	5	-	-	6	6	6
	5	5	5	-	-	5	-	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	6	6	-	-	6	-	6
	6	7	7	6	-	6	-	7
	6	7	5	-	-	6	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.5

General Comments:

- Well thought out given site gymnastics.
- Nice attention to architecture and consideration to aesthetic for an industrial site.
- Nice package. Like architecture. Landscape could be more exciting, particularly out front.