

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | PRESENTED: January 6, 2010 | |
| TITLE: 3201 Anderson Street - Madison College Parking Lot. 17th Ald. Dist. (16829) | REFERRED: | |
| | REREFERRED: | |
| | REPORTED BACK: | |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary | ADOPTED: | POF: |
| DATED: January 6, 2010 | ID NUMBER: | |

Members present were: Bruce Woods, R. Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Todd Barnett and Mark Smith.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 6, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a Madison College parking lot. Appearing on behalf of the project was Wade Wyse, JSD Professional Services and Fred Brechlin, Facilities Architect Madison College. Wyse began by noting recent modifications to the plans as previously requested by the Commission highlighting the following:

- The 5 foot by 5 foot tree islands have now been removed and are designed as the location for proposed pole light fixtures that were previously located within the centrally located bio-retention area.
- The address of concerns relevant to the use LED-type fixtures relative to issues with snow and frost along with a review of the overall photometric plan.
- The distribution of handicap parking stalls in various areas across the proposed surface parking lot to accommodate the array of activities it serves.
- The use of the maximum amount of small/contact parking stalls allowed by ordinance at a threshold of 25% of the total proposed.
- A review of the bleacher details on the west and in the parking along with protective measures which include landscaping and bollards, etc.
- A review of existing tree vegetation on the site noting the inability to provide for preservation due to the issues with the desirable species of the plantings and as well as their location in conflict with proposed surface parking.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Want to see tree caliper at a minimum of 2 ½ inches in order to off-set and provide for a more substantial planting due to the amount of clear-cutting of existing tree vegetation on the site.
- Thin and taper out berm/planting screening along Anderson Street combined with adding trees to the east of the main drive aisle entrance.
- Change out and add diversity to the plantings within the bio-retention mix to replace the varieties over extensive use of Black-Eyed Susan and Purple Coneflower.
- Make sure that there are not crabapples proposed within tree islands that would provide conflicts with vehicles and their occupants; crabapples are only appropriate as part of perimeter screenings.

- Some trees shown along Anderson Street are noted as “PC”, no reference as to identity as provided within the legend. If it is a pear it is OK but prefer larger canopy trees. Pear may be OK if they are a columnar variety and make sure that they are maintained over time.
- Tree islands need to meet the ordinance requirement for vegetative cover with any mulching to be bark mulch.

ACTION:

On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Smith, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0). The motion provided for the incorporation of the minimum of 2 ½ inch caliper trees within the parking lot and the following:

- Thin and reduce the number and proximity of trees within the berm screening along Anderson Street combined with the addition of trees along the easterly side of the driveway entry.
- Provide for more diversity in the bio-retention seed mix to lessen the amount of Black-Eyed Susan and Purple Coneflower varieties.

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, 6, 6, 5, and 5.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 3201 Anderson Street

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Member Ratings | - | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| | 5 | - | 6 | - | - | - | 6 | 6 |
| | 6 | - | 7 | - | - | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| | 7 | - | 6 | 6 | - | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| | 6 | - | 6 | - | - | 6 | - | 6 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 5 |
| | 5 | - | 5 | 5 | - | 6 | 5 | 5.5 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Nice attention to parking requirements. More diversity in bio-retention zones desired.
- Disappointed that no trees were saved. Sends wrong message.
- Good incorporation of UDC feedback – Thank you!