

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> April 7, 2010
TITLE: 4622 Dutch Mill Road – Demolition and New Construction of an Office Building in UDD No. 1. 16 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (17628)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>POF:</b></span>
DATED: April 7, 2010	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 7, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of demolition and new construction located at 4622 Dutch Mill Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Wilfred Johnson, Joe Ellis, Robert W. Gile, all representing the VFW; and Steven R. Ring, representing All Construction & Design, Inc. Ring began by detailing recent modifications to the plan to address the Commission’s previous comments on the project as outlined within a cover letter within the application packet. The presentation provided for review of site context photographs, along with the following:

- Use of a light gray colored soffit as a desired preference to the suggested terra cotta colored soffit.
- A four-inch bump-out at the main entry with siding to be turned around the backside corners.
- The addition of paired doors at the front.
- The utilization of a consistent overhang on the sides and rear of the building.
- Further explanation and detailing of granite pole supports for the extended roof canopy, noting adequate clearances provided to diminish their potential as unintended obstructions.
- The addition of a stormwater detention pond at the rear, along with significant modifications to the landscape plan to provide for trees and additional plantings in response to the Commission’s previously reviewed comments.

The packet also included a request to maintain consideration of the original site plan as proposed, at the same time provided for an alternative site plan, moved the building forward towards the front lot line and easterly toward the side lot line adjoining the driveway on the adjacent site, which did not accommodate the adjacent neighboring heavy equipment company (Miller-Bradford and Risberg, Inc.). Ring distributed a letter from Steven Jensen, manager of Miller-Bradford and Risberg, Inc. noting the preference for the original plan and opposition to the option which places the building adjacent to their driveway entry. Ring noted that it was preferred to maintain the original site plan as approved with the parking in front and the building to the rear to not obstruct the driveway to the east and be consistent with the development pattern on the adjacent lot to the east, as well as the currently vacant lot to the west (the site of a demolished hotel). Staff noted that the site to the west would be required to provide for formal Urban Design Commission approval upon its redevelopment.

Following the presentation, Wagner thanked the applicants and architect for their patience and effort to address the Commission's concerns. Discussion by the Commission was as follows:

- Relevant to the building rotation with the alternate option, the example validates that the building could be set closer to the street. The original version would be precedent-setting in Urban Design District No. 1; based on previous approvals and ordinance provisions. The original version was problematic, a suburban solution that provides no access from sidewalk to street and requires crossing a parking lot.
- Provides no address of request to reduce impervious areas.
- Return of materials on the corner to the back side of the building should be 5'-6', would support initial if building is rotated.
- Support by Ald. Compton on the original version was noted as communicated in an email to the Commission.
- Question the loss of 40-foot plus trees lost to site development. In addition, question the size of proposed trees, should be a minimum of 2 ½" in caliper.
- Question what happens to the existing shared drive with the property to the west. Question how much more logical to maintain rather than provide for the new driveway as proposed.
- Appreciate change to light fixtures. It was noted that the change through a flagpole light at its base and the use of soffit lighting was appreciated.
- Consider adding a transom above paired doors to enliven entry.
- Conceptually support moving to the street but no gain of anything by moving to the street based on context.
- Resolve issue with proposed drive and maintenance of existing drive to the west with the City Traffic Engineer.

Following a motion by Wagner, seconded by Luskin, to grant final approval, discussion was as follows:

- Alternate site plan places more parking closer to building and provides more safety.
- The orientation on the alternate site plan is more successful relevant to pedestrian access and safety, where the original version sets a precedent in Urban Design District No. 1 and could support alternate site plan.
- Three-inch caliper trees minimum but decry the loss of existing trees due to pre-development site clearing.
- Appreciate improvements but in Urban Design District No. 1 requires address of street where the original version is precedent-setting or alternate version provides better orientation for both automobile and pedestrian access.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Smith, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the project based on the alternate site plan as presented with further consideration of the project requiring a full landscape plan to come back, plus pedestrian access to the public sidewalk, resolve driveway access issues, along with the architecture modified to work with the alternate building siting. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with Wagner and Luskin voting no. A previous motion by Wagner, seconded by Luskin, for final approval noted that in light of existing context, aldermanic support, neighbor issues, combined with improvements to the project over the previous original version merited approval. That motion failed on a vote of (2-6) with Wagner and Luskin voting in favor; and with Rummel, Smith, O'Kroley, Barnett, Slayton and Harrington voting no.

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, 6, 6 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
<b>Member Ratings</b>	4	5	3	-	-	4	-	-
	5	6	5	5	-	5	5	5
	6	7	5	3	-	6	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	6	6	6	6	-	-	6	6
	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
	5 (original) 6 (alternate)	5	5	-	-	4 (original) 6 (alternate)	4/6	5

General Comments:

- Disappointing to see 40” trees removed that could have been designed around.
- Support new use but request applicant comply with UDD No. 1 and reorient to street per the “alternate site plan.”
- Appreciate revised site plan.
- Thank you for all of the effort – good project.
- Reorientation seems to offer a safer parking lot. Considering the amount of open space the building would seem to deter from the view to the neighboring property only from a limited angle. Study connecting sidewalk to public walk to encourage future walkability.