

AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: May 5, 2010
TITLE: 4622 Dutch Mill Road – Demolition and Construction of an Office Building in UDD No. 1. 16 th Ald. Dist. (17628)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: May 5, 2010	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Richard Wagner, John Harrington, Jay Ferm, Ron Luskin and Mark Smith.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 5, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of demolition and construction of an office building located at 4622 Dutch Mill Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Steven R. Ring, representing All Construction & Design, Inc.; Robert W. Gile, representing the VFW, and Joe Ellis. Ring presented details on two versions of the site plan. One provided for the location of the building at the front within the side yard; where the “preferred option” provides for the building at the center of the site with front yard parking, as originally proposed but amended to reflect previous comments from the meeting of March 17, 2010. Staff distributed the report from the meeting of March 17, 2010 noting that the applicant has tried as much as possible to reduce the amount of impervious surface consistent with specific comment to move the building parallel to the road and distribute the surface parking at the front of the building at the widest point on the lot as referenced. This revised version (preferred option) also provides for a walkway for their clientele that also doubles as an additional backup space for vehicles. Ring presented the revised plans showing an overall reduction in paving on the site, movement of the building and relocation of the detention pond in front, along with the siding returned 4-feet around the corner. Staff noted the parking and service areas screening requirements for UDD No. 1 and various options (guidelines) for screening with either building mass principal or accessory, earth berms, masonry walls, hedges, trees and decorative fences as referenced by ordinance. Ring stated that this orientation of the building makes it possible to see the front from all angles on Dutch Mill Road. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- The front of the building remains on the side (version that received initial approval).
- Appreciate the calculations on the impervious areas.
- Feel strongly that if we don’t bring the building to the street it turns into a sea of parking.
- More walkable, gracious, building is more visible.
- Prefer the version given initial approval.
- Building could be tweaked so the front is seen.
- Allowing for front yard parking sets the pattern on a small scale.
- Landscape plan could go further with grasses around the pond, ornamentals would help take the asphalt away (screen). Use plantings as a base to help mitigate that parking.

- All your shade trees need to be more than one species and species that grow more than 6-feet.
- Place the boulder wall away from the stalls.
- Consider placing a monument sign out near the street.
- Don't see anything specifically in the UDD No. 1 Guidelines that requires the building to address the street. The revised plan is better than the first because you have reduced the impervious surface. Dutch Mill is not a frontage road at this point and doesn't have the same standing as if it were a frontage road (to the West Beltline Highway). Parking guidelines are met.
- Look at ways to have the drive more direct.
- Not convinced either rendering is the solution but loathe designing the project; that's not our purpose.
- Appreciate the effort to reduce impervious pavement.
- Not convinced that not utilizing the shared drive makes sense in this location. Would be nicer to have fewer drives.

Ald. Judy Compton had the following comments:

- Don't agree that seniors should be parking in the dark in back of the building surrounded by trees.
- Agree the landscape plan is not adequate but approval could be given at this point.
- Don't like option that features the building turned, blocks adjacent development.
- Would like to hold on to the bit of diversity in building types on this street.

Continued comments from the Commission were as follows:

- If you use this design as the benchmark you will end up with a street and 60-feet of parking in the building setback.
- The landscape plan needs a real boost. Need to enhance the pond. Having no trees in the front seems wrong; need at least 3-4 species of trees. The more trees you put in the better the carbon footprint will be.

ACTION:

On a motion by Luskin, seconded by Wagner, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with Smith and Barnett voting no. The motion passed with the condition that the applicant bring the landscape plan back to the Urban Design Commission for final approval based on address of the following:

- Go farther on the landscape plan to include grasses, more plantings around the surface parking area along with more diversity on tree plantings in greater number.

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, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5.5 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 4622 Dutch Mill Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	6	5	-	-	5.5	5	5.5
	4	6	4	4	-	4	5	5
	5	5	5	-	-	5	5	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	7	6	6	-	-	6	-	6
	5	5	4	-	-	-	5	5
	5	6	4	-	-	5	4	5
	5	5	2	5	6	6	6	5
	4	6	4	5	-	5	4	4

General Comments:

- Poor benchmark for what urban design is about.
- Building design is fine. Site plan is poor – building should be closer to street, please. Very flawed logic!
- Setback of building sets bad precedent for this corridor.