

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: April 1, 2009
TITLE: 2101, 2109, 2115 East Springs Drive – Conditional Use/Planned Commercial Site; 99,000 Square Foot Retail Building, Steinhafel’s. 17 th Ald. Dist. (12240)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: April 1, 2009	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Mark Smith, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Jay Ferm, Dawn Weber, Marshal Rummel, Ron Luskin and Todd Barnett.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 1, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a conditional use/Planned Commercial Site located at 2101, 2109, 2115 East Springs Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Larry Stone and Alan Theobald, representing Steinhafel’s Furniture; Paul Skidmore, representing Iconica; and Gary Steinhafel, Juliette Wegner.

The modified plans as presented provided address of the Commission’s previous concerns from the meeting of January 21, 2009. Following the presentation staff noted comments from Kevin Firchow from the Planning Division regarding “Large Retail Development” contained within Chapter 33 that require address. Staff noted that the ordinance provisions provide both the UDC and Plan Commission a regulatory framework for review of “big box development;” where Firchow’s report noted several deficiencies. Discussion of the project by the Commission on these standards was as follows:

- Project as designed is a superior design solution which may outweigh the project’s minor deficiencies. Concerned with pedestrian flow would walk on the other side of the main entry and each sidewalk from the street.
- Concerned with pedestrian crossing over the drive aisle entry to the north with the adjacent bowling facility.
- Need bike parking beyond the 10 for the Steinhafel’s building, especially at the main entry.
- On the south and east facades of the Steinhafel’s building, the vertical pilasters are sufficient to address Section 33.02(4), but place lighting sconces on the pilaster, the overall facades are okay due to their orientation.
- Per Section 33.24(4)(f)7, need direct pedestrian entrance to East Springs Drive; needs to be visible.
- Per Section 33.24(4)8a &b, 40% vs. 60%; this is a new clean site, no impediments to address. Building can be stretched and reconfigured to address.
- Per Section 33.24(4)(f)10, relevant to screening of loading and storage, concerned with view from the bike path needs screening.
- It’s okay to use bike path to access Steinhafel’s building where the 40% to 60% main issues to be addressed.

- The walkway okay for the 10K outpad site as well as the Steinhafel's building which provides for less impervious surfaces.
- The buildings' locations ties the site together well especially in comparison and context with adjoining/existing development.
- Use a lot more native species adjacent to Starkweather Creek. Placement of plants around bike path should have a more natural character including the detention pond area and use more groupings and openness.
- Don't want to see a parking lot in a green area within a proposed green area at the street between outpad sites. Not concerned about the 40% vs. 60% building frontage issue with 75 feet of right-of-way.
- Look at more direct sidewalk connections, extend details of native area within five feet of the bike path with prairie vegetation.
- Compare to existing development within the area, the project raises the bar as far as expanse of green space.
- Place a piece of sculpture closer to the street where only one has been identified within the plan.
- Make clearer your sidewalk connectivity.
- Sidewalks to connect to buildings and bike path.
- Can reverse buildings to meet the 60% requirement.
- Like the south building's scale, but it could be modified as an option to meet the letter of the code.
- The southerly building entrance should be visible from East Springs Drive.
- The entry from Building #3 should be visible and accessible from the sidewalk.
- Placeholder future parking shown on the plans between buildings 2 and 3 should be green, not paved.
- Make natural areas more natural with the use of native plantings.
- Provide appropriate landscape screening at the loading area for the Steinhafel's building.
- Pave the current bicycle path to connect to the Steinhafel's building.
- Consider connecting the north drive aisle walk to east to the Steinhafel's building.
- Provide bike parking at the front of the Steinhafel's building.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2-1) with Slayton and Weber voting no and Luskin abstaining. The motion required address of the above-stated comments and noted that the superior design of the multi-phase project and its context with adjacent existing development mitigated minor issues with its consistency with the big box standards for "Large Retail Development."

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, 7 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2101, 2109, 2115 East Springs Drive

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	7	6	4	8		7	6	7
								8
	7	6	5			6	6	6
	7	6	5			6	6	6
	6	6	6	6	5	5		6
	6	6	6			6	6	6
	6	6	7	8	5	6	6	6

General Comments:

- Applicant working very hard to make an outstanding, pedestrian-friendly and beautiful project. Good, creative infill project.
- Applicant’s superior design treatment merits consideration for a waiver. Street frontage may not meet building % requirements but offset by greenspace, no parking facing street site design overall.
- Fairly attractive big box project has made big strides in addressing UDC’s comments.
- Pull south sconces to pilasters.