

## AGENDA # 8

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

**PRESENTED:** April 9, 2008

TITLE: 1277 Deming Way – RPSM Parking  
Variance. 9<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (09694)

**REFERRED:**

**REREFERRED:**

**REPORTED BACK:**

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

DATED: April 9, 2008

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Bruce Woods, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Bonnie Cosgrove, Richard Wagner and Jay Ferm.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of April 9, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of an RPSM Parking Variance located at 1277 Deming Way. Appearing on behalf of the project were Gene Post, Dean Health Plan; Doug Hursh, representing Dan Edge-Dean Health Plan; Kris Williams, Dean Health Plan; and Andrew Van Haren, representing Old Sauk Trails Park Architectural Review Committee. A review of the overall master development plan for Dean Health emphasized the relationship between existing and future building expansion, existing surface parking and recently approved additions to surface parking as part of the Call Center, in combination with a future addition to the Call Center, an office addition to the main building, a future office building along the property's Deming Way frontage, as well as consideration for a future parking structure at the rear of the site to accommodate an array of current and future employees utilizing combined facilities. The applicants noted the need for the parking lot expansion / variance was based on the projected loss of shared parking on the adjacent Edgewood site, in combination with the impact of visitors, contractors, consultants and employees utilizing both the Headquarters Building and the Call Center underlying the need to provide for more parking on the site as proposed. The applicants referred to details contained within the cover letter within the application packet. The applicants further noted a discussion with Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator, provide that the 450 total stalls to be developed on the site, including the parking lot addition were below the threshold of the maximum number of parking stalls allowed on the site according to provisions of the zoning ordinance. In response to issues raised relevant to a request for a Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDM), the need for additional parking was noted, as well as options to provide development of on-site parking with no formal plans for a Transportation Management Plan at this time. Williams provided details on parallel contingencies relevant to TDM measures such as off-site/work at home arrangements with employees, encouragement for employees to utilize mass transit, as well as other alternative modes of transportation; that get to minimize the amount of necessary on-site parking. Williams noted that Dean Health Plan encourages bus ridership and biking has but no ridesharing program, no bus sponsorship for employees, and no shared parking arrangements with adjoining property owners outside of the non-guaranteed relationship with the adjacent Edgewood College building. After the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Same issues not addressed, lack of integration of parking where future and current approvals allow for development of compliant parking without a new parking addition.

- Parking area breaks up site, is non-compliant to the tree island requirement, need to provide information of how circulation of new parking functions with new and existing parking, buildings and building additions, as well as provisions for development of future structured parking.
- Response to the Transportation Demand Management Plan not being formally considered makes it difficult to consider the parking variance as requested.
- A reminder of issues with the previous consideration of the project was stated by Woods, acting as chair from the report dated March 26, 2008.
- A primary issue is with the non-integration of new parking with future office building abutting Deming Way, as well as existing development.
- Need to provide more interior tree islands within the parking addition.
- Need parking and walks between buildings, as well as integration with existing and proposed surface parking areas.
- Stated but not noted within the previous report on this item and re-stated during discussion was a suggestion to look at other areas of the site and possible locations for the parking lot addition, not requiring a variance.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Ferm, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-1) with Slayton voting no. The substitute motion to refer required that the application come back with a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management Plan and address concerns within this report, as well as the previous report. In addition, provide alternative plans for parking on the south side of the property that may offset the need for parking within the variance required area. A previous motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel for **REJECTION** of the project noting failure to address previously stated concerns failed on a vote of (3-5) with Barnett, Rummel and Slayton voting in favor; and Woods, Harrington, Cosgrove, Ferm and Wagner voting no.

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 0, 0, 1, 2, 2, 2 and 4.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1277 Deming Way**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	0	-	0	0	-	0	-	0
	0	-	0	-	-	0	0	0
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	4	-	-	-	-	5	-	4
	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2

General Comments:

- You did not address anything UDC requested. The lot does not satisfy ordinance, complete failure – you need to make an effort to make this approvable.
- Strong TDM before more pavement.
- The proposed parking is not at all integrated with the rest of the site.