

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: September 26, 2018	
TITLE: 2402 West Broadway – Major Alteration to Kwik Trip Located in UDD No. 1. 14 th Ald. Dist. (52832)	REFERRED:	
	REREFERRED:	
	REPORTED BACK:	
AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary	ADOPTED:	POF:
DATED: September 26, 2018	ID NUMBER:	

Members present: Richard Wagner, Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Lois Braun-Oddo, Rafeeq Asad, Tom DeChant and Christian Harper.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of September 26, 2018, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a major alteration to Kwik Trip located at 2402 West Broadway in UDD No. 1. Registered in support of the project was Bjorn Berg, representing Kwik Trip.

Underground fueling equipment has a life span. This site has maybe a few years left of compliance with the EPA; Kwik Trip has to do something in order to stay in business at this location. After looking at their options for the site they decided to add more fueling positions and add a second canopy while rebuilding the existing fuel canopy. They are trying to make the tightness of the fueling positions better and easier to accommodate customers. They have altered the parking in front of the building to increase space and make things safer for people backing out. They are proposing to close one driveway and widen the other while moving it farther from Broadway to help with vehicle stacking. There is residential to the north of the site and across Fayette as well. The present height of the canopies is approximately 16-feet; the new canopies would be from 17'6" to 19'6". There are no changes proposed to the building. The canopies today do not have brick on the columns; in meetings with City staff it was noted that fueling canopies should look similar to the site on East Washington Avenue.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Your site plan doesn't show the nearby residential uses that staff has concerns about in their report.
- It seems your light is spilling out from the canopies. We don't have anything that says where the existing light is falling and how your changes will affect that.
- It would help me to see a before and after, visually and lighting-wise. There was a staff request about an LED lighting strip that not go around the canopy because of the nearby residential.
- Is that new vegetation around the canopy or existing?
 - That is all new.
- It's going to take a while for those trees to grow and do any screening on that side.

- There are some tall Arborvitae on the north property line.
- The other concern is sometimes trees go away and you would have lighting spilling over.
- I see existing large sections with river rock mulch. Are we going to request that those be converted to wood mulch, as well as the new areas so it matches and is in compliance with our desires?
- No gravel mulch.
- Regarding lighting, when Zoning and Building Inspection do their review they do not take into account the trees.
 - (Tucker) They'll be required to provide photometric plans and fixture cut sheets to show that light doesn't spill over the site lines.
- This is a very difficult set of drawings to navigate through for our purposes. Your site plan does not talk about the new or existing canopy, doesn't indicate the height of the canopies, it's difficult to tell where they're located. You are building a new canopy and I believe that's where the light trespass concerns are? I presume the building effectively blocks some of that light. The new canopy (westernmost) could be designed with some cut-off feature and lowered.
- Why do you want to reduce the parking?
 - It's a site circulation concern. It's more a function of trying to get the fueling canopy positioned properly.
- The new fueling canopy location is different than the existing one?
 - There's currently on site today one fuel canopy and we're proposing to replace that. One replacement that would move to the north closer to the building, plus altering the dimension between people parked perpendicular to the store and basically forcing us to alter the arrangement of the parking at the building going to a diagonal instead of straight. To compensate we've added two stalls to the west and maintained four stalls on the east side of the store.
- To the point about the new canopy, because you don't have trucks going through can that be significantly lower than the other canopy? It looks like you could take it down at least five feet.
 - We have a lot of canopies that get hit. Trucks aren't supposed to go there but...
- My point is you could still reduce the canopy height and clear a box truck.
- The visual relationship between the building and the canopy, we want to see that.

ACTION:

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Braun-Oddo, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion passed on a vote of (4-1) with Asad voting no.