



Project Address: 1904 Bartillon Drive
Application Type: Public Building, Dane County Men’s Homeless Shelter
UDC is an Approving Body
Legistar File ID #: [78514](#)
Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Background Information

Applicant | Contact: Jon Evans, City of Madison Engineering Division | Carl Miller, Dimension IV Madison Design Group

Project Description: The applicant is proposing the construction of a new two-story building (approx. 51,000 square feet) for the City of Madison and Dane County Men’s Homeless Shelter.

Project Schedule:

- UDC received an Informational Presentation on June 28, 2023.
- UDC granted Initial Approval on November 8, 2023.

Approval Standards: The UDC is an **approving body** on the proposed building. Pursuant to MGO Section [33.24\(4\)\(d\)](#), *“The UDC shall approve plans for all buildings proposed to be built or expanded in the City by the State of Wisconsin, the University of Wisconsin, the City of Madison, Dane County, the Federal Government or any other local governmental entity which has the power to levy taxes on property located within the City.”*

At the November 8, 2023, meeting, the Commission granted Initial Approval of this item with conditions that generally spoke to providing additional details related to utilizing a more consistent application of materials and design features across all four elevations, providing fence/screening materials, incorporating articulation into material transitions, utilizing a more cohesive/consistent canopy design, providing site lighting information, and various landscape modifications, including the use of bark mulch and native plantings, etc. The Commission’s subsequent review and continued evaluation of this item should focus on whether those conditions have been addressed.

Summary of Design Considerations

As noted above, it is the role of the UDC to review the revised drawings for consistency with the conditions of approval as outlined below. Please note that as conditions of approval, they are required to be met. The UDC’s role is to ensure these previously established conditions are met, however they cannot waive or change these requirements. Staff requests the UDC’s final action to reflect the following:

- Decrease the wall heights on the patios or incorporate lower sections that allow for visibility into/out of the patios.
- Provide materials samples and a final materials board as part of the Final Approval application.
- Look at the cohesiveness of the overall building design, including incorporating similar design elements and level of design across all elevations (i.e. color, windows, etc.).
- Revisit the design of canopies, including general mass, scale, walls and design of the canopies.

- Provide a fence detail and material giving consideration to utilizing a material and color that is more cohesive and complementary to the overall building design.
- Refine the composition of materials and transitions (i.e. limiting coplanar transitions, incorporating relief).
- Provide details of the green walls, including the plantings, trellis feature, and giving consideration to revising to be more consistent in design and composition across all green walls (i.e. spacing, orientation, organization, pattern, etc.).
- Provide a photometric plan and fixture cutsheets.

With regard to lighting, staff notes that while a lighting plan was included in the submittal materials, refinements to the lighting plan are necessary to bring the proposed lighting into compliance with MGO 29.36, including maximum average light levels and uniformity ratios. As such, staff recommends that a condition of approval be included regarding lighting, including whether the review and approval of such could continue administratively as part of the Site Plan Review process.

- Update the landscape plan to incorporate native plantings into the landscape plan.
- Update the landscape plan to reflect the use of bark mulch, not stone.
- The applicant shall provide higher quality/resolution materials.

Summary of UDC Initial Approval Discussion and Action

As a reference, the Commission's discussion and comments from the November 8, 2023, Initial Approval are provided below:

The Commission had the following questions for staff and the development team:

- The staff report talks about the refuse enclosure and the lighting. Could you identify both of those on the slides or give an explanation?
 - We will have some lights on poles in the parking lot, we're for planning wall packs on the building and sconces at the entry. The dumpster enclosure will be similar construction to the fence, a metal infill panel with metal posts. It will have a covered area for storing lawn equipment and snow blower.
- The living wall on the southeast entry, could you elaborate on the system, the plants, it's up high so I'm wondering what you had in mind there.
 - We're still working out some of our final details. The general concept is locating planters above the vestibule, that way it will be that Virginia creeper or Boston ivy, it will have someplace to take root and climb the trellis. We're still researching viability, it's a work in progress. If that feature were to go away we would still try to mimic that look but it could turn into an art mural instead, to relieve the maintenance of that. It's the same scheme for the area behind the flagpole.
- The small area on Plan E side of the building, near the trash enclosure has stone mulch, I'm wondering why that one small area has stone mulch compared to the rest of the plan?
 - I believe it had to do with where we were pushing snow, but I will have to check.
- The fence design material, the metal infill panels, do you have any images of that?
 - I can plan to include those when we're back to our final. Jon does have a sample of our roofing material available, the fence is the same material, but with a different finish.

- The living wall, I do know that Virginia creeper will lose its leaves in the wintertime. What is behind that wall? While the proposed plantings are growing we will be looking at what's behind it for a long period of time.
 - The trellis is installed over an ACM panel, the same material as on other areas of the building.
- What is access for maintenance?
 - Both of those would be by ladder access with personal fall restraint protection.
- Could you walk me through where there is ACM panel, metal panel and masonry? It's very dark and I'm struggling to understand the differences and what is where.
 - Brick is on the lower portion, above there is the vertical wood look metal panel. The ACM metal panel, that is similarly dark gray is only at the entry.
- So what's behind the trellis?
 - It's also that ACM material. The proposed green wall has brick behind it.
- Can you also speak to the canopies and the angle proposed? In the renderings they look quite angled and others are quite tall, I'm wondering what the intent is; sun protection, wind protection, weather protection or just a feature.
 - The translucent panel is to shield guests from the rain. The rationale for the angle was to be more inviting. The patios have a much lower slope, partly because we have our green roofs above there.
- In terms of form, massing, overall design, maybe those canopies could be more cohesive. Some of them are angled, more cohesion with all of them being similar. Same material and orientation all the way around, that will bring cohesion to the building.
- I would like to understand the design aesthetic, maybe it's just not clear in the renderings, it is kind of hard to understand. This is a men's shelter, why a black base, why color only on one portion? What's the intent for the overall design of the project?
 - Overall we're trying to make it lean, more masculine with darker materials, but not serious or looking institutional, so we wanted pops of color and playfulness. The dark brick and dark general scheme tends to relate to other buildings in the area. We're trying to keep in that motif.
- I think when you come back for Final that could be explored more. There's a delicate balance between losing your masculinity and being playful. I understand the program, but I don't understand how the exterior relates to the interior. Why only one area with the playfulness, why not have that come through the exterior in all areas, or just more than that one elevation? The front elevation, doesn't necessarily relate to the other three elevations. You've got randomized windows and colors, the trellis, but the other ones are ribbon windows or punched openings that are very standard.
 - We are trying to strike a balance. We wanted a lot of daylighting. The vertical offers more playfulness but less daylighting. Along the east side of the building that is really not visible except by the neighboring building, it's really not seen and we didn't think it made sense to introduce that in that location. Same with the back where it's not very visible.
- I think that could be explored more as well.
- The two canopies, what's the intent for those, they are very, very high. You want a human scale to canopies, to feel like you're protected from the sun or the weather. I don't know that it's going to do anything that high in the air. Looking at the scale of some of these elements and bringing them down to more of a human scale. Your canopy doesn't have to be at your roof height, it can be right above your door so you feel like you're under that and not just exposed to the elements.
- I would look at the fence. If it is designed to contrast the aesthetics and materials of the building, then okay, but if it's not then you might want to look at that material selection.
- In the renderings it looks like you have 3-4 material types including glazing, ACM, brick but they all look co-planed, is that how they are designed?
 - Yes.
- There's no push and pull or tectonics?

- Yes, they are relatively in the same plane. There is a little between the brick and upper metal siding, but it's pretty minor.
- Consider some relief in those materials.
- Could you explain the canopy and that two-story porch?
 - That canopy is over a portion, both sides area accessible from inside the building. On that upper floor those canopies because there's a certain population of our guests that are smokers, so we had to locate it 25-feet from the door. Raising it high allows the smoke to dissipate better.
- OK, it wasn't clear. I read that as two totally different things. The one above that is just missing the actual...
 - The one above is a section cut through that patio, the one on the west elevation below it is where you can see the whole thing with the background is greyed out.
- That makes a lot more sense.
- I did notice as you zoomed in it was very difficult to read anything. If the next time the presentation file could be at the same resolution as the plan set that would help us in our review.
- Wonderful project. I agree with the previous comments from my colleagues. This is Initial, so I'm trying to focus more on the site. Would you describe the parking lot location on the north side, and then maybe also the fence and the intent of that fence is?
 - The parking lot is there largely for access to the kitchen for deliveries, it's that upper right corner.
- Through the existing McDonald's site?
 - Yes. Our parking lot is a little further away than we would like, but being in the TOD we pushed the building up to Bartillon and we couldn't fit it along the side. The back of the site is where it fell. For the fence the intent is to create a visual barrier between the two rather than a physical barrier. If someone really wanted to walk around it they could, it's really just to give some privacy to the site.
- I interpreted those as gates through the fence. Is that the intent?
 - No, it's going to be solid, it doesn't follow along that detention pond, it stays along that 42" easement all the way to the patio.
- The rendering seems to suggest a pretty solid, opaque fence, is that the intent?
 - The fence is meant to be opaque, metal panel infill.
- Will you say again the intent of the covered patio areas, is it to be accessible from the outside without having to go through the building?
 - It's designed to be accessed from inside the building, so you don't have to go outside to get there.
- My experience of similar facilities is the occupant spending time outside. In looking at the site plan I'm wondering about places for people to be outside with some solar exposure and I'm just not seeing where that can happen. I'm leaning more towards understanding covered canopies can be nice refuge from the rain, but looking for opportunities to reduce that canopy coverage so people can find places to be in the sun. That's why I'm wondering about parking lot placement to the north and the building pushed to the south. I think there are opportunities to reduce that coverage potentially if the project team agrees that being able to be in the sun might be a positive.
- I want to cheer you on about the living wall. I'd like to ask about the railings, along those outdoor spaces facing Stoughton Road will be great space for people to be outside, there is some area not covered. But what makes that elevation prevalent is that guard wall, what materials are on there?
 - At the lower patio wall that will be the same brick as around the rest of the building, up to a translucent wall to lets light through but is not see through. Above there is the same metal panel as on the upper portions of the building, with translucent panels as well.
- I think those outdoor spaces are going to be a wonderful place to be. I understand your use of dark color, maybe blue could be a nice option rather than black. I'm thinking of spending time outside on

those balconies, some kind of wood material that is nice to sit around. I encourage you to maybe show more detail on that and think through that in more tactile finishes.

- I'm trying to understand the patios, is that a wall or railing?
 - Along the patio on the first or second floor? The panel is translucent kalwall version.
- Inside of a wall? It is not a typically cable railing situation?
 - Yes, inset into the wall.
- Is it a wall on the upper level as well?
 - Yes, both of those are walls, kalwall as punched openings, it is six feet tall, the other is probably eight feet in total height.
- Residents are in that space, they can't see out? It's like a pen? What's the point? Is it a smoking patio? It feels like a room without a ceiling or roof, is that the intent?
 - The intent was to provide privacy from the outside in. That's one of the issues we're having with the temporary shelter on Zeier, which detracts from their dignity. The thought was to give guests privacy.
- Does that need to occur on the upper and lower floors? What if the lower were more private but then on the second level you get more transparency so you can see out and feel like you're not behind the wall? It could be a wall but maybe there's some relief in it where you can see out. Part of the issue is we absolutely have to have a better quality of renderings when you come back.
- I want to acknowledge the change in windows, I think they're much better. There is still some work to do, but they are much better.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Any motion that is made should include a condition that material samples are required with the Final Approval request.
- I'm just left with what Rafeeq was saying, if this was an apartment with a balcony and the walls went all the way up, you'll feel really closed in, you want to see what's going on in the world. At least portions of it could be low or transparent so you don't have to stand on a picnic table to see over.
- Other than that I think from where we were before this is a huge step forward. To me this doesn't look like a cold, institutional building thrown together for the least possible cost, it's made great strides toward being a nice building.
- It is a huge improvement from what we saw last time. Definitely revisit those patios, its counter to the program and won't be an enjoyable space. With all the improvements that have happened, definitely take another look at the cohesiveness of the design. How does this transfer to some of the voids in the patio, how do you get some of that playfulness and rhythm all through the building and not just one area. There are opportunities to bring some of that rhythm and asymmetry to the other elements of the building, specifically the parts that are attached. When we look at these rooftop areas, that's where you can put some real emphasis on playfulness and materiality to make it a much more dynamic space.
- It could undulate like the walkway does.
- I agree, I could support Initial Approval for this project. I do find a couple of issues that I would like to see clarified. The quality of the renderings, I really struggle to follow. It is also really helpful to see north arrows on plans to better understand context and movement of the sun. In some cases, it was difficult to read text, especially when looking at planting palettes. I would like to see, there was mention of native plantings, but the renderings still show quite a bit of lawn, especially along Stoughton Road, which could help soften the transition between the building and Stoughton Road. I have concerns with regard to the lack of consistency and cohesion between the canopies and window design. That needs to be looked at and where the color is looks very applied right now, almost looks like someone got out their palette of post-it notes. I would like to see that looked at more holistically. The idea of human scale need to be looked at, that impacts the porches or balconies. That impacts somewhat also the fencing, which is a very different color palette and looks very unintegrated. The goal is to provide this private

space, but looks like the true definition of the fence, keeping people separate from something else. I would like to see the overall colors revisited of the metal panels, the ACM and the masonry. It feels very dark to me. At least explored. Maybe we just need to see the actual materials. The living walls, I don't mind having the trellis' on the one section, but I am disturbed that we are using an entire elevation and showing a beautiful green, when we don't know if there is budget for it and it will be blank wall. There was one other thing that needs to be included in the motion, which is to make sure we get a photometric plan and fixture cutsheets.

- I want to point out there is a really generous swath of native seed provided which is awesome. I didn't look at the species composition of that mix, but maybe for next time we can dig deeper. I'm not yet sold on the fence material and will need more information next time I asked about the one area of stone mulch, point being why change it up, plants do better with bark mulch, let's just stick with bark mulch. The plants on the trellis and the living wall, the southeast entry and south façade, to go along with all the other discussion about playfulness and fenestration, there's a lot of different patterns happening and some of it is very successful. There are some details on the living wall, there are a couple of different patterns, a grid block, vertical bands and then next to that there are playful up and down pattern. A lot going on in the same view, finding a datum at the building corner that carries through. Something that keeps is together as one expression.
- Those species you mentioned can really take over, make sure you do your homework and check those species. They might end to clinging to the building and come off of the trellis to grow to anything they can find, especially the Boston ivy. There might be other options out there that fit this project. You definitely made it less institutional than last time, I think you're definitely on the right track.
- If the County or City does not have the staff to trim that back, then all of the sudden you have a potential problem on your hands.

Action

On a motion by Asad, seconded by von Below, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**, with the following findings/conditions:

- Overall, the Commission finds that the general massing and site development plans are acceptable.
- Decrease the wall heights on the patios or incorporate lower sections that allow for visibility into/out of the patios.
- Provide materials samples and a final materials board as part of the Final Approval application.
- Look at the cohesiveness of the overall building design, including incorporating similar design elements and level of design across all elevations (i.e. color, windows, etc.).
- Revisit the design of canopies, including general mass, scale, walls and design of the canopies.
- Provide a fence detail and material giving consideration to utilizing a material and color that is more cohesive and complementary to the overall building design.
- Refine the composition of materials and transitions (i.e. limiting coplanar transitions, incorporating relief).
- Provide details of the green walls, including the plantings, trellis feature, and giving consideration to revising to be more consistent in design and composition across all green walls (i.e. spacing, orientation, organization, pattern, etc.).
- Provide a photometric plan and fixture cutsheets.
- Update the landscape plan to incorporate native plantings into the landscape plan.
- Update the landscape plan to reflect the use of bark mulch, not stone.
- The applicant shall provide higher quality/resolution materials.

The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0).