

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** April 18, 2012

TITLE: 801 South Park Street - New
PUD(GDP-SIP), Mixed-Use Development
(Erin Square) in UDD No. 7. 13th Ald.
Dist. (16320)

REFERRED:
REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:

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

DATED: April 18, 2012 **ID NUMBER:**

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

*Slayton recused himself on this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 18, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD located at 801 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were John Bieno, representing TJK Design Build; and Jeremy Alsaker, representing Travel Mart, Inc. Appearing in opposition but not wishing to speak was C. Snyder. Appearing neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak were Seth Nicholson and Mike Pudelwitts. Appearing neither in support nor opposition and wishing to speak was Aaron Crandall. Appearing neither in support nor opposition and available to answer questions were Theresa Kopish and Greg Kopish, representing the Monona Bay Neighborhood Association. Bieno stated that sound from the menu board is no longer an issue after testing. He presented a letter from the neighborhood group in support of the project, with a few contingencies; they are open to those contingencies except for the fence which they request remain at 8-feet. They took the opportunity to go back to the drawing board and use an architectural element that matches the curve of Park Street at that location; the curve of that element is anchored by the entry into the tenant space. Simple masonry on the backside of the building and a warm color palette will tie things together while keeping it simplistic.

Huggins remarked that the landscape plan is excellent. Rummel inquired about signage; a blade sign will face Park Street and the live-work space entry will face Park Street as required by UDD No. 7.

Seth Nicholson spoke to the changes since the last draft of plans. He lives in the house directly behind this space and will be highly impacted. His concerns include access to the alleyway; when you look at the proposed dual lanes, he sees a 3-foot adjustment in the building that could realistically run a fence all the way along the alley and not allow access. He is also concerned with light pollution in his backyard.

Ald. Sue Ellingson spoke to the alley. She spoke with City Engineering, who suggested putting a sign opposite that driveway that goes into the alley saying “left turn only.” They were not willing to block the alleyway.

Nicholson replied that his concerns center on increased traffic coming through the alleyway and it will get congested.

Mike Pudelwitts inquired about fencing and where it would be located. He supports the fencing and shares concerns about the increased traffic in the alleyway. Huggins stated that this is really the purview of City Traffic Engineering and they have reviewed this. In terms of solutions, putting a sign was the answer the alder got in prohibiting traffic turning to the east; she did not ask about making the alley bigger.

O’Kroley talked about this more modern form and the understanding of the building’s planes. The portion of the building for the technicality of the live-work unit, she can’t understand if that’s something applied to the building or is the building form now undulating to strictly meet the letters of the code. She suggested studying the change in material from metal panel to hardiplank which goes to a more “residential” structure; where the geometry of the building’s elevations needs to be resolved and cohesive.

Harrington inquired as to what happens when traffic at the two ends of the alleyway meet; there’s a concern about the exiting pattern. Most alleys are not used for an escape lane for drive-thru restaurants. He has concerns about how this could be resolved. Rummel asked if the alley was not there, how would the circulation pattern move through the site? Bieno responded that the basic answer was that there is an alley so they do not have to look at other options.

Theresa Kopish spoke to concerns about the hours of operation. She also inquired about what would happen if this particular business didn’t make it; would the contingencies with this development apply to another business as well? Alsaker (the local franchisee) stated that he read the neighborhood association requests and Dunkin Donuts is fine with their requests. Kopish is pleased with the developer’s response to their concerns and the neighborhood is happy with the new “squawk box.”

ACTION:

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (3-2) with O’Kroley and Rummel voting no; Harrington and Huggins voting yes, and Lufler, acting as Chair, breaking the tie; Slayton recused himself on this item. The motion provided for the following:

- Acknowledgement of conditions supported by the applicant from the neighborhood association.
- Resolve conflicts/make more comfort with two cars coming together in the 8-foot alley as much as possible with adjustments to the building, on-site amenities the overflow lane issue, including the size of parking stalls, drive aisle width, landscaping and screening, including options to facilitate drive-thru circulation on-site.
- Address comments on the current form of the building.
- Report from Traffic Engineering on the use of the alleyway; specifically how two cars can move through this driveway without any problems.

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 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 801 South Park Street

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

General Comments:

- Struggling with circulation issues and reliance on alley.