

AGENDA # 11

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: April 22, 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 22, 2009	ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 22, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL 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. In coordination with the presentation of the revised plans in address of the Commission’s previous comments on the project for April 1, 2009, staff summarized issues to be resolved with the proposed plans; where the presentation team provided details on specific modifications to the plans in address of the Commission’s concerns. During the review of the plans and accompanying applicant presentation, staff noted that many of the comments by the Commission relevant to the project during its discussion were not totally consistent with the Commission’s subsequent initial approval of the project. Staff further noted that the motion for final approval of the project referenced that the “superior design of the multi-phase project and its context with adjacent existing development mitigated minor issues with the consistency with the standards for “large retail establishments (big box standards).” Following a building materials, color and palette review, staff noted that signage details contained within the proposed package would require separate consideration due to issues with its consistency with the Street Graphics Ordinance that will require approval as part of separate future public hearings as either multiple variances or exceptions to be approved under the standards for “Comprehensive Design Review.” Further discussion by the Commission noted the need to provide address of previously stated comments relevant to the use of more native species adjacent to Starkweather Creek, along with the placement of plants around the bike path to be more natural in character, including the detention pond area along with the use of more groupings and openness. Additional remarks on this issue required change to some of the plant species against Starkweather Creek to provide alternatives for the proposed use of Austrian Pine, Wayfaring Viburnum and Blackhill Spruce. It was further noted the arrangement against the creek was not natural, along with a reiteration for the need of providing groupings of trees in a more natural patterning and layout.

ACTION:

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-1) with Luskin abstaining. The motion noted that the project represents a superior design where its context with existing and adjacent development mitigates minor issues with consistency for big box standards (provisions for “Large Retail Establishments” within Section

33.24(4)(f) of the Madison General Ordinances) and recommends that the Plan Commission waive any deficiencies with these standards.

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 and 7.

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
	6	6	6	6.5	6	6.5	5	6
	6	6	5	-	-	6	6	6
	6	6	4	5	-	6	6	6

General Comments:

- Solid “infill” project for build-out lot.
- Appreciate the adjustments and effort.