

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** May 22, 2013

TITLE: 915 Haywood Drive – New Construction  
in UDD No. 7 for “Ryan Brothers  
Ambulance.” 13<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (30101)      **REFERRED:**  
**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary      **ADOPTED:**      **POF:**

DATED: May 22, 2013      **ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Henry Lufler, Acting Chair; Lauren Cnare, Cliff Goodhart, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant and Melissa Huggins.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 22, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of new construction located at 915 Haywood Drive in UDD No. 7. Appearing on behalf of the project was Jenny Acker, representing Ryan Brothers Ambulance. Registered and speaking neither in support nor opposition were Paul Marunich and Kathryn Haubert. Staff noted that this building is off of Park Street where there is cross access between the Shell Station, Famous Dave’s and other businesses, which makes it a Planned Commercial Site; it is also in Urban Design District No. 7. Acker presented the current building to be demolished, showing it in context with surrounding buildings. Ryan Brothers would like to build an office building to house their staff. Taking into account the new buildings across the street, they will try to incorporate the same brick elements. It will have a brown roof with brown stucco base, with some blue in the corners. There is some contaminated soil on the property, some of which has already been mitigated. The building will also use geothermal equipment.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The building is overwhelmed by the roof that overhangs the brackets. Given what the staff recommendations/comments are, a simple parapet with a flat roof would be better and maybe even work to tie into the existing building.
- You could simplify the building. The portico makes it look like an entry but the entry isn’t there.
- A base on the building would be nice; maybe the base could just be expressed as the entire accent band of brick. Just to give it a little bit more hierarchy and less residential feel.
- Rather than have a parking space that is a backing-up space, make an opening and insert another tree so that as the afternoon sun comes in it won’t heat the parking lot as much.
- There’s another opportunity in the bioinfiltration area to put in another tree. They (City Engineering) can find a tree that’s appropriate for bioinfiltration.
- The line of arborvitae, when it’s installed it’ll be great for the first 5-10 years. Maybe look around town at what happens to arborvitae over the course of several years. Think about the plow that will come in and what it will do to the trees.

- The strong line that ends at the building, I would suggest another at least minor tree to fill that end.
- Any opportunity to provide an outdoor space for people would need shade. (the open space).
- The low grow Sumac spreads like a demon and takes over everything, pick an alternative.

Paul Marunich spoke as a neighboring property owner. He is pleased to see the building demolished. His concerns include along the back lot line where people cut through his property to get to the gas station; Acker responded that they will be installing a fence.

Kathryn Haubert spoke as an area resident. She wondered about where she would park during construction and how long construction would last. Acker replied that they would not be touching that parking lot at all; and the timeframe would be anytime in the next six months and would last about 120 days.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Cnare, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0). The motion required that the applicant address architectural and landscape comments upon return for final approval.

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 rating for this project is 5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 915 Haywood Road**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	5	5	5	-	-	5	5	5