

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** May 22, 2013

TITLE: 2501 East Springs Drive – Conditional **REFERRED:**
 Use/Planned Commercial Site, Goben Auto **REREFERRED:**
 Sales Facility. 17th Ald. Dist. (28663)

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: May 22, 2013 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Henry Lufler, Acting Chair; Lauren Cnare, Cliff Goodhart, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant and Melissa Huggins.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 22, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a conditional use/Planned Commercial Site for Goben Auto located at 2501 East Springs Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were Arlan Kay, Amy Hasselman, Don Goben and Al Bachmann. Changes to the plans include a sidewalk area for the property next door that could be a future development site, and maintaining the pedestrian walkway through the hotel and restaurant area. They are differentiating the roadway material through the lot. The Commission had suggested a guardrail on the wall because of its height; they have moved the display area back several feet and included bushes to keep people away from the wall area. All the drainage and water detention will be handled on the site itself. The design concept is to have the retaining wall all the way around the site to give a visual base to the virtual storefront. The 10-foot utility easement area is heavily landscaped with flowering prairie plants. In response to requests from the Commission to simplify the building, the front will have the metal roof and overhang while the backside will remain more utilitarian and without the overhang. Material selections have been simplified to include smooth masonry on the bottom, the masonry body in split face cream color, all the metal (roof overhang, soffits and brackets) in a red color with the awnings and storefront material to match. The base retaining wall will tie back into the materials of the building. Slayton recommended adding a 2-3 foot radius on the “saw tooth” curbs of tree islands where cars may rub against them because of the tight turning radius.

ACTION:

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0). The motion noted adding a 2-3 foot radius on “saw tooth” elements of tree islands.

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 rating for this project is 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2501 East Springs Drive

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Member Ratings | 5 | 6 | 6 | - | - | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** April 3, 2013

TITLE: 2501 East Springs Drive – Conditional Use/Planned Commercial Site, Goben Auto Sales Facility. 17th Ald. Dist. (28663) **REFERRED:**
REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary; Jay Wendt, Urban Design Planner **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: April 3, 2013 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Henry Lufler, Cliff Goodhart, Marsha Rummel, Dawn O’Kroley, John Harrington, Richard Slayton and Melissa Huggins.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of April 3, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a conditional use/Planned Commercial Site located at 2501 East Springs Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project Arlan Kay, Amy Hasselman and Don Goben. The intent of the design is to create a “picture window” for the display of automobiles. Primary access for the site is off of an internal block shared two-way private drive that minimized driveway openings and access to abutting public streets. A small building in the center of the lot will be used as a supervisory station. The site does not expect to generate much traffic as car lots generally do not receive many customers per day.

Ald. Joe Clausius was present for an earlier item and noted his support for the project pending address of staff comments and concerns.

Staff gave a brief history of the site, noting that when it was originally platted it was intended for office/commercial uses. All the driveway locations were laid out to minimize their impact on the surrounding streets and were reliant on internal circulation of the internal drive aisle. The covenants eliminated restrictions to these types of uses but at the same time, any development of these lots, because of the Planned Commercial Site standards requires approval by the Plan Commission and the Urban Design Commission because of the size of total amount of development that will occur on this block. The pedestrian access, internal circulation and building location are still at issue with the Planning Division.

Ald. Clausius supports this project and sees it as much improved but also wants it to address that come out of the approval process.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- On the building placement, it would be nice to see it relate to either the hotel placement or support the future commercial rather than being placed furthest back from the street.
 - It's placed here to support an expansion to the east. The way this was platted really forces us to bring the building up farther than we wanted to.
- Is there any way to raise the ground on the downside of the wall so it's no more than a 2-foot drop? Basically what you've got is a walkway adjacent to a 3-foot fall.
 - There are landscape areas there.
- The building has a lot going on; the colors, angles and different projections could be simplified. A car is metal, it's sleek and this has more of a rustic, heavy feel to it.
 - This is the look they want, they don't want it to look too modern, that way it doesn't just look like a gas station/used car lot.I'm not thinking traditional, I'm thinking more modern, more sleek, more smooth, less projections and brackets.
- The building almost looks like you've retrofitted awnings to it. This building is yours out of the gate, to get it to do what you need it to do.
 - I think the awnings really give the building class.
- From a pedestrian standpoint, we're starting with one of the worst parts of town. I think considering what we've got to work with here, this works quite well.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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 and 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2501 East Springs Drive

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Member Ratings | 6 | 4 | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| | 5 | 5 | 5 | - | - | 5 | - | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Too much going on with design and colors.