

AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: June 7, 2006
TITLE: 8202 Mid-Town Road – PUD(SIP), Veterinary Facility. 1 st Ald. Dist. (03198)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: June 7, 2006	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Ald. Noel Radomski, Lisa Geer, Michael Barrett, Todd Barnett, Robert March, Bruce Woods and Cathleen Feland.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 7, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(SIP) for a veterinary facility located at 8202 Mid-Town Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were John Silbernagel and Bernie Lange. Prior to the presentation, staff noted to the Commission that this item, although previously granted initial approval (on April 5, 2006) was listed as new business on the current agenda due to a change in architect's from Steve Kieckhafer, AIA, Plunkett Raysich Architects, LLP to Josh Johnson, AIA; Cowell Dubleton and Bernie Lange of the Renschler Company providing for a modified but similar proposal as previously reviewed. Dubleton and Lange noted the following regarding their modified proposal:

- The project still will be LEEDS certified, provides for a building located at the corner of Mid-Town Road and Waldorf Boulevard as previous, including provisions for essential rain garden/open space (large) and a southern bioswale provided.
- The building was reduced in size by approximately 2,000 square feet and includes a stair tower entry element at the corner.
- The building materials complement area buildings, utilizing reddish brick, textured concrete panels, clear anodized windows and trim, in combination with wood paneling.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Need to provide more of an emphasis on the stair tower/entry at the corner. Use only as an exit.
- Need to provide a management plan for the prairie areas (noted as yet to be developed); use plugs in detention area.
- The street corner treatment still contentious issue with this as well as previous versions of the project.
- Need to make appeal to pedestrians with design addressing the corner.
- Conflict with the nature of the use of the building and the way it is laid out; doesn't lend credence to its location at the street corner.
- Question windows on the lower south elevation and not east elevation. Provide pedestrian appeal on the east elevation to provide pedestrian appeal on the east elevation.

- Consider windows on the east elevation at grade to make it appeal to the pedestrian level if grade allows.
- The back door approach with the exit door at the corner provides that the building is turning its back to the street. Why not provide windows on the upper level on corner on the waiting room on the northeast corner of the building.
- Need to provide a friendly inviting face to the passerby, needs to be visually more inviting. Consider windows in the stairwells to break up the mass, vision glazing creates a more friendly appearance, along with consideration of adding a canopy treatment over the door.
- Pull windows across south elevation to the stair tower to open up the building and provide an accent corner treatment.
- The east wall of the building appears the most unfriendly and needs more openings (windows) and coloration.

ACTION:

On a motion by Feland, seconded by Geer, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-1) with Barrett voting no. The motion for initial approval required that the applicant provide additional openings on the Waldorf street side elevation, reexamine general treatment of the building façade at the corner to relate to pedestrian level as elaborated within the above stated comments.

A previous motion by Barrett, seconded by March, to refer to resolve issues failed on a vote of (2-6) with Wagner, Woods, Barnett, Ald. Radomski, Geer and Feland voting no. As a follow-up to the motion for initial approval, a motion by Barnett, seconded by Woods, reopened consideration of this item for review of material samples and colors. The motion to allow for the review of the material samples and colors passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0).

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, 6, 6, 7, 7 and 7.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: Mid-Town Road and Waldorf Boulevard

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating	
Member Ratings	8	6	7	-	-	-	7	7	
	6	6	8	-	-	6	6	6	
	6	7	7	-	-	-	5	6	
	5	6	7	6	-	5	5	5	
	8	6	9	-	8	8	6	7.5	
	5	5	6	5	-	5	4	5	
	8	6	8	7	-	6	6	7	
	7	7	8	6	-	7	7	7	

General Comments:

- Project needs to address street and corner. Good start.
- Add windows as suggested. Improve relationship of building to street corner.
- Architecture a bit too minimal, but good site plan.
- Corner needs to be significantly enhanced.
- Appreciate the corner entrance at Mid-Town Road and the additional pedestrian access throughout the site to appreciate the site amenities. Very inviting site and landscape plan. Open landscape up on corner of Mid-Town possibly eliminating the evergreen trees.
- Corner isn't there yet. Work on east elevation.