DRAFT

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	**PRESENTED:** November 19, 2014
TITLE: 5712 Odana Road – Demolition of a One-Story Wood Framed Office Building for the Construction of a New Parking Lot for "Smart Motors" in UDD No. 3. 19th Ald. Dist. (35814)	**REFERRED:**
	REREFERRED:
	REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	**ADOPTED:** **POF:**
DATED: November 19, 2014	**ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O'Kroley, Richard Slayton, Melissa Huggins, Tom DeChant, Lauren Cnare and Cliff Goodhart.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of November 19, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the demolition of a one-story wood framed office building for the construction of a new parking lot for "Smart Motors" in UDD No. 3 located at 5712 Odana Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Allen Foster and Jim Triatik. The concern is keeping it as uniform looking as it is now. They do want landscaping low across the front because they want customers to be able to see the vehicles. Where they do not have vehicles displayed they have higher landscaping. The Secretary noted that the Urban Design District requirements call for a minimum of 30" to grow to a mature height of 54". The types of landscaping listed include Magic Carpet Spirea, Juniper and Arborvitae are not the best plantings to address this criteria. You could do a lot better to try to at least maintain what is considered the maximum height of vegetation. At the same time, this is 700-feet of display area, the request is to have a 10-foot landscape buffer only in front of the wood building that is going to be demolished. It could be tiered to complement the display.

The Commission discussed the following issues:

- The plant material that's being used is filling stuff. It's not "driving down the road, make a statement." You need to make a statement. Why aren't there trees in your tree islands? That just needs to happen. There's a collection of different plants that as you're driving down the road make no sense. I don't think the 3-foot plus height is unreasonable, and I don't have the same concern you do. When I look at used cars I drive through the lot. I don't want people to look for used cars while they're driving down Odana Road. If you look at the 10-foot buffer, if you put a plant further away from the car that helps with what you're trying to get at, but what we need is to have more of a homogenous look. The use of Diablo Ninebark is fine, that has a certain character and it is a certain size. There are some smaller scale Viburnums that will get to the height you're looking for, and these are robust. We're happy to work with your landscape architect, but I think what we're doing here is basic "you don't want to do that but you have to do that."

- You're planning to redevelop this relatively soon. Is there some of this area that's not going to be redeveloped? John Harrington, who is not here tonight, always talks about the heat island effect and if there's a way you could give us some advantage on the heat island effect by planting more canopy trees than which you have there, is there an area that's not going to be re-dug up where you could add more trees?
- When they do build the building, the maximum setback is 65-feet, they encourage the building to be closer up.
    - If you can give us some lenience on this now, knowing that we will be back in the future with a more comprehensive proposal with this new building. We just hate to do all this work to just tear it up in 18 months.
- If it's 65' or 85', the front landscaping is not going to change.
    - We're looking to reconfigure these, it's going to look very similar to the new car showroom across the street.
- Let's agree to the ultimate plan and see what pieces from that ultimate plan can go in, and then not waste your money putting in things that aren't acceptable.
- We could agree that within the space that we currently have proposed, just have better landscaping.
- It's going to be a condition from the Plan Commission. I don't see the issue about only having a 10-foot swath in front of the building to be demolished a problem. We're not talking about the entire strip.
- I'm curious about the phasing. This seems like a lot of effort if you know you're going to dig it all up. So eventually it's all going to become one parcel, and for sure when that comes to this Commission and staff they're going to tell you, you need that 10-foot buffer all the way up.
    - We're prepared for that.
- OK, so we're phasing, you're going to do an appropriate phasing of landscaping now so you don't have to rip it up. It seems silly to fight this fight now when ultimately you're going to be asked to have that 10-foot setback.
    - My concern goes back to what are we going to do here that ultimately needs to be redone.
- What I'm hearing and what I see in the staff report is the most important thing is that frontage. And what I heard Dick trying to get at is what can we mitigate in that area you're going to redevelop? But that frontage is likely going to stay the same, and you can stage your construction so that you don't upset that planting. If you need some leeway, we could give you some leeway perhaps on the tree islands where for sure you're going to be ripping that up.
- Again, if you talk about 65-foot setback or 85-feet, your first two rows of parking, plus the two-way drive aisle, plus the landscape buffer won't be touched, they're going to be the same.
    - That means the building and the parking are right next to each other. I've got all this greenspace here I could use but it's City property.
- It's like anybody else's property, you don't have the right to landscape the right-of-way. I don't see the real hardship in you meeting this requirement. The maximum 85-foot setback is not going to change. You still have enough space with the 85-foot setback.
    - What I'm trying to avoid though, I don't have to design my building around what we just did.
- The last comment in the staff report talks about what's required, that's an ordinance.
- We have a problem in that you want to do something different than what you have before us. You're asking for a temporary use that is not very clear to us in light of how it's going to change. It would be a lot easier if you had a master plan we could see, it would also be better if we had some context. We don't really have the components to make the right judgment, and we have an ordinance to follow, so it's hard for us to buy any arguments about not doing what the ordinance says, because we have no ways to make those other judgments because the pieces aren't here.
    - I appreciate that. So as it's proposed, it's outside of the ordinance?

- Yes. The other thing is in the past with your other developments, we had a master plan, and a commitment as to when things were going to change as part of the approval.
- I think we've tried to work with you on this.
- This is all display parking in here? Are we able to reduce that 24-foot drive aisle, because it's sales staff and not the general public parking in and out of there? It's not a parking lot, it's a display area. If you could get some relief there, 4 or 5-feet, and try to accommodate that setback.
- The other facility you did down the block they have staff parking in the front. Is Traffic giving up on that standard to allow for stacked display?
    - No. Typically you wouldn't want to do that with used cars. It's different than with new cars.
    - This used to be a UW Health Clinic before we purchased it. When we came before this Commission for it to be demolished we said we'd be back within 18 months to talk about doing something else, and we did. I'm asking for the same thing now, can we come back in 18 months.
- I think we need to see the building. Meeting Zoning, meeting the current code. The only thing different between those other approvals and now is we have a different code that applies (previous car dealership on Odana Road).

ACTION:

On a motion by Cnare, seconded by Huggins, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0).

The motion provided for the following:

- The applicant must meet the 10-foot landscape buffer.
- A footprint of the new building should be shown on future plans that address current Zoning Code and Urban Design District Number 3 requirements.
- The addition of canopy trees in the tree islands shall be addressed.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 5712 Odana Road

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

General Comments:

- Whole property needs a master plan.