



Agenda Item #: 3

Project Title: 3326 Agriculture Drive - New Addition to Existing Manufacturing Building Located in Urban Design District (UDD) No. 1. 16th Ald. Dist.

Legistar File ID #: 71615

Members Present: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Tom DeChant, Rafeeq Asad, Christian Harper and Jessica Klehr.

Prepared By: Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary

Summary

At its meeting of June 15, 2022, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of an addition to an existing manufacturing building located at 3326 Agriculture Drive in UDD 1. Registered and speaking in support was Margaret Anderson, representing Danisco USA, Inc. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Josh Myers, Jeff Rath, Stacey Brockett, Lisa Goeman, all representing Shive-Hattery; and Eric N. Hohol, representing IFF.

The proposal is similar to previous projects in this location and will allow for an increased capacity of the business. The view of the building diminishes as you move from east to west on the W. Beltline Highway. The expansion will include new pavement and new fire road, as well as landscaping to extend the current line of trees and shrubs along Agriculture Drive, which buffers the site in a way that won't be disturbed if additional future expansion occurs. The proposal extends the current look and feel of the site including landscaping, color and materials, using the same metal as on other buildings in this campus.

The Commission discussed the following:

- I have no objections to the expansion of existing metal materials.
- Consider adding 2-3 trees back in on south side of the building to help with heat gain with the metal material.
 - We did remove three trees to allow for the building expansion. We have added trees to the perimeter along the street. We left those three out of that area for future expansion possibilities.
- With all that metal it would be nice to have more of a buffer, I do recommend adding more trees back to the south side of the site.
- The building materials are not objectionable, but I do question the stone mulch.
 - Regarding rock mulch vs. bark mulch, we are a facility that must comply with FDA and Wisconsin Agriculture standards, so we keep rock near the building to avoid animals nesting there or coming inside. We have used rock mulch throughout the landscape for a continuous look. We could transition away from the building to bark mulch.
- It looks like everything north of that driveway is bark mulch and everything south is stone. It is very neatly manicured and very well maintained stone, and I would not suggest you rip out what is existing. If you continue stone down to the south there is a precedence for it.
- If this was new construction I'd say bark mulch. The stone is fine in this application, especially since it's more of a light industrial area and not really visible to many.
- The bottom southernmost five plants are white pines and are spaced pretty far apart. I would encourage the applicant to up that by two or three pines and put them closer together to achieve realistic screening.
- Are the trees between the driveway and berm existing and to remain?

- Yes, that can be accomplished via grading.

Action

On a motion by Braun-Oddo, seconded by Klehr, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (5-0).

The motion noted the following:

- The Commission finds the use of metal materials on the building's exterior acceptable.
- The Commission accepts the stone mulch as continuous of existing conditions.
- Maintain the trees within the loop road on the south side of the berm.
- If it can be accommodated, the three trees on the south side of the existing building should be replaced/relocated to the south side of the proposed addition to help break-up the façade.
- Increase the number of white pines located along the street frontage, two or three trees, and locate them closer together.
- Submit a lighting plan, which can be approved administratively by the UDC Secretary.