

## AGENDA # 2

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> November 16, 2005
TITLE: 5201-5301 Femrite Drive – Two Multiple-Tenant Buildings in Urban Design District No. 1	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: November 16, 2005	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

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

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of November 16, 2005, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED CONSIDERATION** of two multiple tenant buildings in Urban Design District No. 1. Appearing on behalf of the project were Dave Nelsen and Tim Cleary of Ruedebush Development Construction, Inc. and Michael Johns in opposition. The project, as proposed, provides for the phased development of two multiple-tenant buildings. Building No. 1 is to be constructed as part of Phase 1 is 65,125 square feet in size with Building No. 2 proposed as part of Phase 2 at 54,125 square feet in size. The development of the site, including provisions for shared loading between the two buildings, and various surface parking areas and internal drive aisle/circulation system will provide that 40% of the site will be pervious in combination with the maintenance and buffering of existing wetlands on the site and 60% of the site will be impervious area. The size of tenant space is speculative at this time and will be based on demands of the market. The range of building materials will consist of a burnished block base for both structures with EIFS on upper elevations combined with horizontal metal panels. Following review of the various building elevations, site plan details, along with lighting and photometric plans, the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- Concern with the visibility of the loading dock at the rear of Building No. 1 to be developed as part of Phase 1 until Building No. 2 is approved and completed. The applicant noted that interim evergreen tree plantings could be provided to screen the loading area. In regards to this issue, it was also noted that evergreen tree plantings could be provided within fescue seeded areas to provide for additional screening.
- It was noted by the Commission that in urban design districts, visible surface parking from the Beltline, Agriculture Drive and Femrite Drive, was the issue, especially the front yard parking off of Femrite Drive. The level of surface parking provides for too much paving.
- The project, as presented, is missing contextual information, especially on surrounding lots within the subdivision plat.
- The screening of rooftop mechanicals is an issue. It appears that the structure's design does provide some screening, but sufficient screening of rooftop mechanicals should be further detailed with further consideration of the project.
- Provide justification for front yard parking, as well as considerations for other alternatives.

- Front yard parking, combined with the level of internal access drives provides for an excessive amount of pavement.
- Substantiate as to why Building No. 1 does not address its Agricultural Drive frontage.
- Need to provide tree islands at an interval of 12 parking stalls.
- A landscape worksheet needs to be provided with further consideration of the project.

Michael Johns spoke against the project, raising concerns with site and area drainage, functionality of infiltration facilities and depth of water table as well as impacts on site proposed detention areas.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by March, seconded by Geer, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED CONSIDERATION** of the project. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-1) with Feland voting no. The motion to refer required address of the following:

- Resolve issues with hydrology relative to on-site infiltration, drainage, as well as overall storm water runoff within the area of the subdivision plat and area as a whole.
- Substantiate that effective screening will be provided for rooftop utilities dealing with use from the property's Agricultural Drive, Femrite Drive and Beltline Highway frontages for each of the buildings' elevations.
- Reduce overall paving, especially in the southerly parking area.
- Need to provide a parking lot worksheet relative to landscaping.
- Reduce the amount of land dedicated for internal drive aisle access in addition to providing for a narrowing of drive aisle width from 26 feet to 24 feet when not required for fire access.
- Provide evergreen screening for the Phase 1 loading area in addition to incorporate evergreen plantings within fescue seeded areas, especially on the northwesterly corner of the property.
- Look at an overall design that responds to the entire site context that provides for screening of both surface parking and loading facilities.

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, and 5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 5201-5301 Femrite Drive**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating	
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	
	5	5	6	7	-	6	5	5.5	
	4	5	5	6	-	5	5	5	
	4	5	5	5	-	4	4	5	
	5	7	6	6	-	5	5	5	
	4	6	6	5	-	6	5	5	

General Comments:

- Hydrology, building roof equipment unresolved.
- Add scattered evergreens to screen future parking and view into loading area until building 2 is built along the northwest property line adjacent to detention basin. Narrow access drives which are not five lanes to 24' wide. Submit a parking lot worksheet. Determine if infiltration is possible on site and whether more ponds will need to be located.
- Work on reducing paving; fitting it in with the site better.
- Site design should respond to context.