

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** August 12, 2015

**TITLE:** 4747 Waukesha Street – School Building,  
Addition and Renovation to Hamilton  
Middle/Van Hise Elementary School. 11<sup>th</sup>  
Ald. Dist. (39390)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

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

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** August 12, 2015

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant, John Harrington, Cliff Goodhart, Richard Slayton and Lois Braun-Oddo.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of August 12, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of an addition and renovation to Hamilton Middle/Van Hise Elementary School located at 4747 Waukesha Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Steve Kieckhafer and Rick Hopke, representing the Madison Metropolitan School District. Hopke distributed updated plans at the meeting for a new addition to the north side of the building, contextual images, additional library space and a loading/receiving and drop-off area. Updates will be made to the landscaping with enhancements for an accessible entrance. By relocating an office to a larger space which was previously a music room and getting a new entry off of Segoe Road, it will require a handicapped accessibility entrance which will include a ramp. This will also make the entryway more secure. The overall plan represents a squaring off of the two primary exits (one being a receiving area). Hopke identified natural light areas inside the building. The height of the roof has been brought down and the new addition has been tied in better with the older sections of the building. Building materials include field brick and accent brick in a close match to the existing building; the terra cotta color of the existing building will be matched in the fascia, as well as the gray colors and clear aluminum in the natural light areas. They chose not to replicate the aqua colored panels of the building.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- What we had in our packets tonight varies in some detail (revised plans as circulated at the meeting), specifically on the perspective. The vertical banding and the windows. Are they gone and this is the correct version?
  - This one is more representative due to that corner and how we are getting some of the soft seating area within that location.
- So what is in our packet is not at all accurate? This is what you’re submitting?
  - My regrets, I have to review that further.
- Which one is the actual submittal? We have to approve one of them, we can’t leave you to pick and choose down the road.

- I would go with my submittal.
- So the one in our original packet is the one you're asking for approval, not the one you passed out today?
  - I would request to get the Commissioners' feedback so I can work with AI to find what is most appropriate. It doesn't change the form of what we're proposing.
- You mentioned in your presentation that you took it out because of the need for stacks in that area. Are we moving towards fewer stacks in technology, that maybe the windows would be better.
  - It is actually in the way they present media. We do have some collaborative spaces with soft seating, small group areas.
- If someone were to arrive here and park on the street, the sense of entry and where one should go, I think it could be made clearer, even if it's through the landscaping. Maybe there's a way with the walks where you're creating this promenade if the doors are placed on the sides of the glass volumes. All the stairs and the walks are implying that you want people to walk this way. The glazed openings on the library reads like an entrance as well. That elevation might be more successful with just glass and storefront within the same plane as the typical wall, and then that horizontal band continuous; it would be less of a feature you'd try to enter.
- Could you speak to the 45° angle pieces?
  - We're trying to get narrower slits within the space but still filter light within the space. Primarily they're egress from that space, so I'm trying to downplay them while still trying to get natural light into the space. That's why I chose to skew it off at a 45° angle.
- I would suggest that you might want to put in an Oak hybrid, White Oaks are very slow growing.
- The walpaks on the side of the wall are not represented in the perspective at all. These can be very blinding. They're technically not spilling off of the property line, but I'm wondering if you have another fixture that can distribute the light without having this walpaks. Like the ones you put on West High School. And maybe find a way of getting your lighting without sacrificing that tree.
- Maybe punch out the entire window area enough to have the doors kind of hidden on the sides. You could even do glass all the way up from those doors and then there's no confusion about people peering in.
- That would give you a better transition too of where you're keeping the fascia and where you're stopping the fascia.
- This does not represent the treatment that you have on the site plan. The sidewalk is away from the building, you have green between. Fix that, and a landscape plan will be necessary.

### **ACTION:**

A motion was made by Goodhart, seconded by O'Kroley, to grant final approval. The motion failed on a vote of (3-3-1) with Goodhart, O'Kroley and Braun-Oddo voting yes; Harrington, Slayton, and DeChant voting no; and the Chair breaking the tie vote.

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided for the following:

- The addition of windows to accommodate daylighting.
- Leave the center as it is, the punch without the vertical.
- Different walpaks options should be explored.
- Eliminate the 45° angles and square off the emergency exit elements such that the two doors are facing each other in an east-west orientation.

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 4.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 4747 Waukesha Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	5	4	-	-	-	4	4	4

**General Comments:**

- Landscape plan is missing from packages. Entry sequences are poor. Packages are incomplete and must be submitted one week before Urban Design Commission presentation.
- Documentation needs to be complete, consistent and accurate!