

## AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> May 3, 2006
TITLE: 3434 East Washington Avenue – New Construction, a Building Addition in Urban Design District No. 5. 17 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (03436)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: May 3, 2006	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Ald. Noel Radomski, Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Lisa Geer, Robert March and Michael Barrett.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 3, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of new construction, a building addition in Urban Design District No. 5 located at 3434 East Washington Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Barb Ohlsen, Barbara Sneel. Appearing in opposition to the project were Kathy A. Warren and Karen S. Meek. Prior to the presentation, staff noted to the Commission that the project involves an addition to the former “Dean Care: Arcand Park” Clinic now occupied by Access Community Health Care. The project consists of two building additions, one off the front and westerly elevation of the building with the other at the easterly elevation of the building. These additions provide for additional dental exam rooms, medical exam rooms and office / support spaces for the non-profit community health care center serving the uninsured and under insured. The facade of both additions is intended to match that of the existing masonry structure repeating the same style of architecture and matching the materials on the existing facility including same window coloring and fascia material. Existing signage is to be maintained and refaced along with the provision of parking lot directional signs. The applicant noted that the additions (8,817 square feet in total) will not affect the level of required parking since the site’s current level of parking far exceeds that required under the provisions of the Zoning Code. Following the presentation, neighbors speaking in opposition noted traffic impact issues associated with expanded use of the existing facility, formerly a City park, in reference to an email correspondence provided to the Commission by staff. Following the presentation, the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- Concern with the lack of neighborhood involvement and communication, as well as a public meeting regarding the expanded use of the site.
- In regards to development of the clinic in the former park, staff was requested to provide more background information.
- The Commission questioned how many stalls were necessary to support the existing and expanded use of the facility. In question, a potential for removal of more stalls per utilizing the variance process. The applicant noted that removal of stalls would incur additional costs.
- The Commission raised concerns with the impact of the easterly addition on adjacent residential uses.
- The landscaping points requirements appear to be at a minimal level where in an Urban Design District, improvements to the parking lot, including tree islands and other amenities, are required; where the project involves the loss of two trees where additional tree islands in the parking lot can be utilized to offset.

- The easterly addition is adjacent to residential homes where more screening is desired. The landscape plan provides that the former parking islands are paved over along with the need to provide for more interior tree islands along with landscape vegetation around the parking lot to screen automobile lights. Tree islands shall be provided at the normal interval of 12 to 15 parking stalls. Concerns were raised concerning rooftop mechanicals where the applicant noted air-handling unit is at the rear of the existing building on the ground and is sufficient to accommodate the additions.
- The Commission inquired about the provision of an outdoor break space. The applicant noted that two tables existed at the rear of the building and will be maintained. This area should be detailed within the plans.
- Consider eliminating some stalls and replacing with landscaping, as well as create some more outdoor space in addition to buffering of single-family homes to the rear of the sight.
- The motion required the address of landscaping and screening issues including a code compliant parking lot in regards to landscaping, tree islands, and accessibility, as well as the provision of tree islands at a 12 to 15-stall interval along with holding a neighborhood meeting to discuss the proposed development with surrounding neighbors in addition to providing a light and photometric plan for review.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by March, seconded by Ald. Radomski, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0).

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 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5.5 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 3434 East Washington Avenue**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	4	5	-	-	-	-	-	4
	5	5	4	-	6	5	5	5
	6	5	5	-	-	5	5	5
	5	5	5	-	-	6	5	5
	6	5	5	-	6	5	6	5.5
	6	6	3	4	5	5	5	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6

**General Comments:**

- At a minimum, a neighborhood meeting needs to be convened. Landscaping plan is minimal, to be kind. Creative thinking can reduce the cost issues.
- Needs more community input.
- Parking lot needs additional landscaping and tree islands per our comments.
- Bring entire parking lot up to City standards, including more interior tree islands with trees. Screening of the residential area from the parking lot should be enhanced.
- Straightforward. However, site development and amenities lacking, specifically too many stalls and not enough landscaping or appropriately located outdoor gathering space.
- Architecture is appropriate. Site landscaping and parking tree islands need to be brought into line with UDD normal practice. Applicant wishes to pull on the cloak of “community”, yet never talked to the surrounding neighbors.