

## AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** February 11, 2015

TITLE: 1610 Moorland Road – Public Project –  
New 50,000 Square Foot Maintenance  
Facility for the Madison Metropolitan  
Sewerage District. 14<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (36900)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: February 11, 2015

**ID NUMBER:**

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of February 11, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a public project for a new 50,000 square foot maintenance facility for the Madison Metropolitan Sewerage District located at 1610 Moorland Road. Nathan Stark presented the plans for the proposed new “non-process” maintenance facility. As a result of their master plan a resolution was put forth to create a new non-process maintenance facility on campus, and renovate two other existing spaces. The new facility would be on the south end of the campus and would dovetail a couple of key site improvements. This proposed project brings the addition of a fourth egress point to the south that will allow for a one-way movement of those large vehicles off campus. The current egress and ingress point is at the very north single point on campus where there is a bicycle path, causing safety concerns. This proposed building is “L-shaped” with a large mezzanine with ¾ of the total square footage being related to garage equipment, the remainder would encompass locker rooms, office space and a training room on the southeast corner. The facility continues to focus on large sustainability efforts that MMSD has in their day-to-day practices; the building is LEED gold certified. The water as it’s treated, as it leaves campus it has a fairly consistent temperature and passes through the building with heat pumps heating and cooling the facility. The building is meant to face the public as much as possible and will have simple wayfinding with the architecture speaking to the architecture throughout the campus. The vehicle garage is utility brick, metal panel and glass for the office, and the workshop area is cement fiber panel; the oldest buildings on campus are modular brick in the same color. Exterior and interior bicycle parking is available.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The doorway and arch seem like it’s cutting that line more than it needs to. Seems not quite resolved.
- I like in general how the landscape plan lays out here, my one suggestion is that you might consider changing out the Spruce. We want trees that age well and will last, something that will survive.
- Is there something in the roof treatment could relate the locker room portion away from the garage and towards the other part of the building, rather than a material treatment?
- It has a sort of organic feel to it.

- The entry isn't any part of the vocabulary of the building. I'd like to see it raised 2-3 feet so it becomes more important.
  - That perspective kind of skews the way those roofs look. When you look at the street view it does enunciate itself a bit more.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**, contingent on landscape adjustments to replace Colorado Blue Spruce with White Pine, adjustment of the door height in the glassed arched opening on both the north and south elevations to match with the horizontal mullion pattern on the adjacent arched glass opening, and use of a different type of bicycle rack. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0).

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 rating for this project is 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1610 Moorland Road**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	6	6	6	-	-	-	7	-
	6	7	7	8	-	8	9	8

General Comments:

- Nice addition to campus.