

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

|   |   |
|---|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION  | <b>PRESENTED:</b> March 17, 2010                                |
| TITLE: 4622 Dutch Mill Road – Demolition and<br>New Construction of an Office Building in<br>UDD No. 1. 16 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (17628) | <b>REFERRED:</b><br><b>REREFERRED:</b><br><b>REPORTED BACK:</b> |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary   | <b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>                                     |
| DATED: March 17, 2010   | <b>ID NUMBER:</b>   |

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of March 17, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a demolition and new construction located at 4622 Dutch Mill Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Ald. Judy Compton, Steven R. Ring, Robert W. Gile, Steve Lawrence and Joe Ellis, representing the VFW Department of Wisconsin. Ring provided details with the construction of a new office building for the VFW to replace an existing structure on the site which is to be recycled as much as possible following its demolition. He provided a review of the building materials, colors and site plan details including signage, noting the building’s construction with Nichiha siding on three sides, the rear of the building featuring the use of architectural metal panels. The front façade of the building features an over-extended roof projection underlying slanted pole supports. Ring further noted that the site plan features extensive pavement for the building in order to work with its elderly veteran clientele that utilize the facility. Following the presentation Ald. Compton spoke in support of the project, as well as its previous reiterations that have evolved a long way to the project as currently proposed. She further noted the utilization of front yard parking despite its inconsistencies with the requirements for Urban Design District No. 1. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- The lighting fixtures are very large. Their physical size and location are close to the head of the openings. Crowd openings; too large, look at ways to incorporate into soffits and alternative areas, too large, for use associated with loading docks.
- Use of large flat Nichiha panels around the door disproportional to the rest of the brick building. Also, look at strut details that support extended roof projection, chance of someone knocking into them because of their angle, need something at base to prompt user to avoid.
- Consider double glass panel doors at entry or framed single operable with stationary panel to do the same size and scale for balance.
- Question the need for a 30+ foot depth for back-up space.
- Need to really boost the plantings, need more trees and a pedestrian planting scheme. Change burning bush and viburnum, they have clashing fall color and create a more interesting design at less of a cost.
- Evergreen plantings beneath viburnums necessary; one will shade out the other.

- An awful lot of extra pavement, shorten pavement at southeast corner to replace with aggregate not pavement to facilitate the vehicular movement and provide a more pervious surface.
- Have an 8-foot strip not a 5-foot strip with the accessible stall. Eliminate a stall for a sidewalk for the ceremonial area.
- Provide an 8-foot access strip with accessible stall.
- Replace pavement or aggregate where possible in order to accommodate covert vehicular movement associated with accessible needs.
- Question the radius edge of parking, replace with a hammerhead along the easterly lot line and reduce the amount of pavement.
- Relevant to the overhang on the majority of the building, should treat all four sides the same or treat sides the same as the back with the underside soffit to be “a terra cotta color,” support canopy comments, provide a change in material to metal panel on the backside to wrap around the corners.
- Trees along the south side to shade building and along front to screen parking; should exceed the point value 2-3 times of the Zoning Code based on the site’s location with an Urban Design District.
- Light fixture at the corner of building provides for a lot of glare. Also not shown on renderings. Prefer uplighting at the base for the flagpole fixture.
- Problem with the building’s relationship to the road in Urban Design District No. 1. It is required that parking be to the side or the rear, need to do frame building up to road, especially since it serves a public purpose and to have a stronger presence on the road. The building is nice but question if sign is visible enough from road.
- Building design is good but problem with placement on site.
- Lighting fixtures are too industrial, too large, look at where it is; look at soffit lighting for entry and wall signage.
- Need to provide more site context with presentation as required.
- Look at recently approved projects in Urban Design District No. 1 that conform to providing parking to the side or rear.
- Look at placing building parallel to street to widen area to place more parking parallel to the front of the building to replace the excessive amount of pervious area required to accommodate the number of stalls.
- Bring entry façade out with the change in materials.
- Look at alternatives to handling some stormwater on-site, rain garden and flagpole, etc.
- Like building but relationship to street needs to be reexamined and need to show why you need to do what is proposed.
- Need to provide context information to justify site planning issues.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion for referral required address of the above stated concerns with further consideration of the project.

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 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> | 3         | 6            | 5              | 4                              | 5     | 4                                   | -             | 5              |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | -             | 6              |
|                       | -         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | -             | 6              |
|                       | 5         | 6            | 4              | 5                              | 5     | 5                                   | 5             | 5              |
|                       | 5         | 5            | 4              | -                              | -     | 6                                   | -             | -              |
|                       | 4         | 7            | 5              | 5                              | 6     | 5                                   | 5             | 5              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |

General Comments:

- Site design features extensive re-thinking.
- Comfortable building but not in compliance with UDD No. 1. More context would help justify.
- Limit amount of asphalt by incorporating aggregate at edges (becomes a “warning strip”). Align 8-foot access zone with entry with 8-foot handicapped stall to west. Keep handicapped sign a safe distance from pedestrians.
- Building needs to relate better to street.
- Not quite there yet. Excellent start.