

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 26, 2008
TITLE: 1277 Deming Way – RPSM Parking Variance. 9 th Ald. Dist. (09694)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: March 26, 2008	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Marsha Rummel, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Bonnie Cosgrove and Jay Ferm.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 26, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of an RPSM parking variance located at 1277 Deming Way. Appearing on behalf of the project was Michael Gordon, representing Potter Lawson. Prior to the presentation staff noted that the requested parking variance (allowance) provides for the development of surface parking between the front of a building and the required front or side yard setbacks on a lot within an R.P.S.M. Research Park-Specialized Manufacturing District. The provisions for the allowance are as follows: “A parking lot containing not more than ten (10) parking spaces may be located to the front or side of a building, but not in any required front yard or in the required street side yard on a corner lot. If approved by the Urban Design Commission a parking lot containing more than ten (10) parking spaces may be located in the front or side of a building, but not in any required front yard or any required street side yard on a corner lot.” The project as proposed provides for the development of a 48 stall surface parking lot between the Dean Health Plan headquarters building and the required front and side yard setback. Mike Gordon of Potter Lawson then provided a detailed review of the Dean Health Plan campus and overall master plan, including its future phased development in combination with existing and proposed parking facilities. Gordon further noted that the proposed parking would enable current and future expansion phases. He noted its need because more people per square foot use the current and existing facilities on this site than when contemplated. He further noted that the parking fits within the overall master plan. Kris Williams of Dean Health Plan, project manager spoke to the need to provide for a supply of long-term visitor and accessible parking. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Concern with amount and phasing of parking.
- The proposed parking lot does not relate to the overall master plan in current and future phased development.
- Question the need for the parking area in absence of a Transportation Demand Management Plan. Further consideration for the parking variance/allowance requires address.
- Issue with the proposed parking. It is not designed to be integrated as within the goals for the R.P.S.M. District; a Transportation Demand Management Plan measure should be addressed.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (4-3). With Slayton, Barnett, Cosgrove and Host-Jablonski voting in favor, and with Rummel, Harrington and Ferm voting no. The motion referred consideration of the proposed parking, to address the above stated concerns and clearly define the need for parking relevant to current and future development anticipated on the site, as well as the need to provide for a Transportation Demand Management Plan with further consideration of the allowance.

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 2, 2, 3, 3, 3 and 5.

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
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	3
	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
	5	-	6	-	-	5	-	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3

General Comments:

- Too many loose ends.
- Disjointed parking lot not integrated into site or RPSM goals.
- Parking layout is not integrated with existing plan. But more importantly, proposed location does not look like the only alternative. More study required.
- It seems that there would be options for meeting parking needs would be better integrated with the site plan and would not require a variance.
- Given that there are so many loose ends with long-term plans, this parking solution is poorly thought-out.
- Applicant has apparently not explored options adequately. This thing needs more thought.