

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** October 30, 2019

TITLE: 115 W. Doty Street – Public Building, New Addition and Renovation of the Existing Public Safety Building. 4th Ald. Dist. (57747) **REFERRED:**
REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: October 30, 2019 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Rafeeq Asad, Christian Harper, Craig Weisensel, Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau and Syed Abbas.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 30, 2019, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a new addition and renovation of the existing Public Safety Building located at 115 W. Doty Street. Registered and speaking in support was Doug Hursh, representing Dane County Sheriff's Office. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Chris Harp and Jeffrey Heil, both representing the Dane County Sheriff's Office; and Jan Horsfall. Registered in support but not wishing to speak were Todd Draper, representing Dane County Public Works-Engineering Division; and Scott Carlson.

The development team reviewed the site context, noting that they do not have exterior designs of the building yet, but will be returning for a more detailed informational presentation later this year. An aerial view of the site shows a 10-foot gap between the adjacent buildings, as well as a house adjacent to the building. Building materials will likely be toward the red side, but used so as not to feel like a mega-building. They reviewed floor plans and site circulation, noting that the loading dock wall aligns with the courthouse wall. A massing diagram shows the lower level setback along the street. The day and recreation rooms will face south and likely will use translucent glass that allows light in but blocks views. Massing elevation views of the proposed and existing were shared. They will bring in long views of how it will fit in with the skyline and how it will relate to the courthouse.

The Commission discussed the following:

- You mentioned translucent glass for security, will there be any areas that we notice a different glass from any view?
 - We are looking at some frit coated glass. There are some offices and classrooms which will have clear glass, on this side facing the house, so potentially there will be some differences, but we will look at that.
- You're thinking about it, it's typically something you run into with correctional facilities.

- It is difficult with the office building component, we will have louvers or mechanical systems on the building, we'll try to integrate those. We will have louvers for fresh air for the rec rooms. We were looking at two types of glass, one with the frit dots but also a film that redirects light up to the ceiling.
- The back of the Public Safety Building, the view from W. Wilson Street has interesting detailing on the top floor, which will be covered up by this addition. What is the thought for having that element of design attached to the new addition?
 - The building will come in basically in the middle. We'll keep what remains to the right. The only place were modifying the existing building is where we're attaching to it. We're looking at the intersection of how our building meets this detail here, we're working on that element.
- Can you speak to the decision to overhang the top floors and recess the first floor?
 - It's basically the need for space in order to get the full program onto the site. The other thing is that we are aligning with the courthouse as well, so it matches that street elevation. On the ground floor we have cars coming in, trying to make the sidewalk safe. Wanting to pull the building back so you get some vision triangle entering and exiting.
- Did you have input from City staff for holding that bottom first floor setback?
 - That was a discussion with Traffic Engineering, one of the concerns was that loading doesn't occur on the sidewalk, there's enough depth to get the trucks in and have a vision triangle for cars.
- The staff report commented on the pedestrian experience along there. What opportunities for landscaping or other things are you considering at the sidewalk level?
 - There's not a lot of streetscape for us to manipulate there. We have the drives and the loading area, doors coming out onto paved surfaces, the site slopes as well. We do have some terraces potentially for trees, and we are looking at the two exists to get some transparency and interest for pedestrians. There is not a lot of green space on that site.
- There's not an opportunity behind the sidewalk and building wall to do anything in the middle?
 - Potentially planters.
- You also have trucks coming in the middle as well?
 - Yes.
- Even today that's a pretty inhospitable section of streetscape. I'm concerned this will be negatively contributing to that. Maybe it's not plans, it's lighting or elements of color, something within that overhang volume that creates some sort of streetscape.
- Have you looked into a green roof or solar panels, opportunities to go more sustainable?
 - I don't think there's been a discussion about green roofs up there. The other issue with our height is the solar panels, we'd be interested but they would protrude into the Capitol View Preservation Height limit.
- Check about a green roof, especially with the stormwater. There's not enough greenspace out there for the water.
- Regarding building 112, the house next to it. Behind the house is this lot owned by a resident or is it part of the PSB?
 - The parking lot is owned by the apartment and is not part of our property.
- We cannot expand more floors. What if you want to expand, have you thought about buying that home and moving the building more to the east side? If you could look into that it would be great.
- Is there any talk about that house being removed? What is the distance between them right now?
 - It's 2.5-feet to the property line. It's been discussed as not politically feasible at this point to remove the house.
- Essentially pulling back-of-house up to the street. You're just adding program above it, this is already the intake, deliveries, etc. Is the loading dock going to be open or enclosed?

- We have that enclosed.
- So it won't be an actual open loading dock we'll be looking into.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.