

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: May 24, 2006
TITLE: 3434 East Washington Avenue – New Construction, a Building Addition in Urban Design District No. 5. 17 th Ald. Dist. (03436)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: May 24, 2006	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 24, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of new construction and building addition in Urban Design District No. 5 located at 3434 East Washington Avenue.

Appearing on behalf of the project were Barb Ohlsen, architect, and Joanne Holland. Ohlsen noted to the Commission that it held a neighborhood meeting as requested by the Commission to receive input on the expansion of the clinical facility. As a result of the meeting, additional landscaping and screening had been provided adjacent to the property's northwesterly corner immediately abutting existing residential development. Ohlsen presented to the Commission, two versions of a site/landscape plan including landscape worksheet that detailed under one option the necessary modifications to the site to meet current code requirements where, with the other option, provided for additional landscaping and tree islands necessary for the project located within an Urban Design District. Ohlsen requested the Commission to approve the minimal code-compliant plan. Ohlsen also noted to the Commission that a lighting and photometric plan had been provided for their review that acknowledges the existing situation and requests its approval.

Following the presentation, staff noted to the Commission that the issue of the clinic site being a former park had been verified where the City had exchanged the lands with the County where the County subsequently sold for development as the former "Arcand Park, Dean Clinic" prior to its occupancy by the Access Community Health Care.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- Relative to the two site/landscape plan options, the Commission noted that the property's location within an Urban Design District required that it meet current code requirements as well as requirements for development within an Urban Design District; therefore, Option Number 2 is approved with this approval.
- The existing photometric plan was noted as seriously deficient in meeting current lighting code requirements as well as standards for the use as metal halide fixtures required in an Urban Design District. It was noted that the applicant should aim existing fixtures properly to reduce glare and hot spots.

- Relevant to lighting, the lighting plan was noted that the applicant should consider re-lamping to get rid of hot spots.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Barrett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion required that Option Number 2 of the site/landscape plan was required to be developed with this approval including additional landscaping entry islands with an option for no curbing, with lighting issues to be addressed and reviewed and approved by staff with lighting noted to meet existing code requirements.

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 5, 5, 5, 5, 5.5, 5.5, 6 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
Member Ratings	6	7	4	4	-	7	8	6
	5	5	5	4	-	-	5	5
	-	6	-	4	-	-	4	5.5
	-	6	5	4	-	-	6	6
	6	5	6	4	-	6	5	5
	5	5	6	5	-	4	4	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	5	6	5	-	-	6	6	5.5

General Comments:

- While this applicant admirably serves a needy demographic, this fact does not exempt them from normal community standards applied to other properties in UDDs.
- Need to bring lighting up to City standards. Include existing streetlights and building lights in photometric plan.
- Proper landscaping is a public health imperative.
- Straightforward, simple. Provide landscape islands.
- Additional parking island creates a better balance of shade and landscape within the parking area. Lower light lamp wattage.