

## AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** October 19, 2011

TITLE:      113 South Mills Street – Demolition of Two Residential Buildings for a PUD-SIP for Meriter Hospital Child Care Facility. 13<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (23412)

**REFERRED:**  
**REREFERRED:**  
**REPORTED BACK:**

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

DATED: October 19, 2011      **ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Melissa Huggins, Dawn O’Kroley, and John Harrington.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of October 19, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the demolition of two residential buildings for a PUD-SIP for Meriter Hospital Child Care Facility located at 113 South Mills Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Kirk Keller, Plunkett Raysich Architects; Deborah Scherer, Meriter Hospital. Registered in support and available to answer questions was Garret Q. Perry. Scherer provided an overview of the plans that combine two existing daycare facilities into one new facility as proposed. Keller presented updated designs which addressed the comments and questions from the Commission’s previous review of the project. In terms of opening up the floor plan, they have flipped the programs 180° so that the infant sleeping rooms are now on the other side and the older students are on the Mills Street side. Windows have been added to both ends of the corridors to bring in light. The architecture has been treated by working with forms in the neighborhood, stuccos and hardiplanks with stone bases; the back of the building is treated like a garage since it faces the alleyway. There is more integration with the landscape, using specific elements to engage the students. Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- I like the landscape ideas.
- Look a little bit further at the Craftsmen bungalow buildings; look at the proportion of the siding relative to stucco. The siding is typically more on the base.
- Looking more on what is in the neighborhood, look at soffit/eave details with the dormer roof feature too tight.
- Look at sill treatment and framing.
- Look at little more at the details; you’ve done nice work but need to make sure to follow up on some of those smaller architectural details.
- Too much EIFS; EIFS to ground an issue.
- Needs to be treated as a four-sided building, needs a base going around, like to see the stone on the Mounds Street corner as well, all the way around to the back of the building.
- Change in grade creates a look at the underside of porch and how it hits the building.
- Review your detailing on the curve and framing so it’s strong enough on the covered entry off of Mound Street.

- At Mills Street elevation there should be a relationship with the peaked area off of Mills Street.
- Entry treatment should be consistent between each other.
- You've done work on the front of the building but the base running continuous detracts from those efforts; look at continuous base treatment along Mills, break up as with roofline treatment.
- I would encourage the indoor/outdoor connection as much as you can; extend deck to play area.
- I struggle with the effort to have the mobile playroom be akin to a garage in terms of design, even though it's located on an alley. That's an opportunity for great, light-filled fun space.
- Look at the placement of rain gutters; delineate gutters and downspouts on plans.
- Material of doors impacts on project; should be commercial grade and look at articulation and glass.
- I would be concerned with the selection of River Birch. Check your Ph levels. Question that there is sufficient sun for the River Birch, suggest different species, concern about acidic site and long-term survivability.
- Look at different species besides Froebel Spirea; look at alternative plantings.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (5-0). The motion required address of the above stated concerns.

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 6 and 7.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 113 South Mills Street**

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

General Comments:

- Very good, except EIFS at ground plane.
- Look at eave detail.