

AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: November 2, 2011
TITLE: 113 South Mills Street – Demolition of Two Residential Buildings for a PUD-SIP for Meriter Hospital Child Care Facility. 13 th Ald. Dist. (23412)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: November 2, 2011	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 2, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a demolition for a PUD-SIP located at 113 South Mills Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was Kirk Keller, representing Plunkett Raysich Architects. Appearing in support and available to answer questions were Garret Q. Perry and Gerard Rabas, both representing Meriter Hospital. Keller reviewed changes to the plans based on the Commission’s previous comments, to include the following:

- The intent of the gutters to stay lighter in color.
- The gutters no longer run diagonally across the building.
- The window sills of the buildings to stand out.
- Roof changes so as not to have a flat box form.
- The Mound Street entry will incorporate stone, with a wood look lightening up the porch end.
- The Mills Street elevation has stucco above and cement board siding below.
- The Spirea has been switched to Stephanandra.
- The River Birches have been switched to Winter King Hawthorne to maintain multi-stem character and ovate form but still get the seasonal highlights.

Questions and comments from the Commission were as follows:

- No stone base provided on east elevation, initial approval requires a stone base on all sides of the building.
- Why reduce the slope of the playroom so it doesn’t match the others.
 - Because the users asked for a window into the kitchen that would operable so we worked it in there by dropping the slope.Could you try to make it a little taller? It seems out of character.
- From experience, the cement board trim is very hard to work with. Suggest using natural wood or cellular product.

- Look at the gable window on St. James Court as a single piece, perhaps a larger window.
- Make sure you get your handrail extensions modeled.
- Thank you for modeling the gutters, but not thrilled with the gutter coming down on top of the roof. Did you look at running that one down so as not to erode the shingles?
 - There might be a way to tie that underneath the deck.
 You could get rid of the gutter and run the metal strip along the drip line.
- Take a look at the roof forms on the Mills Street elevation perspective. Something seems uncomfortable in there; large mass has lower base line, uncomfortable and look at middle gable to not clip under trim.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion required the following:

- The stone should be wrapped around all faces of the building.
- Raising of the roof pitch over the back playroom as much as possible.
- Resolution of the trim at the small gable windows.
- Modify the gutter/downspout at the corner to not run across roof.

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, 6, 6.5, 7 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
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.5
	6	6	6	-	-	-	7	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
	6	6	6	-	-	-	5	6

General Comments:

- Solid.
- Very attractive building.

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 th 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
Member Ratings	-	6	6	-	-	-	-	7
	7	7	6	-	-	-	6	6

General Comments:

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