

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: February 22, 2006
TITLE: 2801 University Avenue – Demolition and New Construction of a Gas Station in Urban Design District No. 6. 11 th Ald. Dist. (02890)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: February 22, 2006	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Ald. Noel Radomski, Cathleen Feland, Lisa Geer, Lou Host-Jablonski, Michael Barrett, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, and Robert March.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 22, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of the demolition and construction of a gas station in Urban Design District No. 6 located at 2801 University Avenue. Registered in support of the project was Casey Louther. In response to the Commission's previous review of the project, Louther presented details of the revised plans emphasizing the addition of landscaping around the site, providing contextual information as to the site's locale, along with providing elevational information relevant to the integration of the fenced enclosure for the dumpster area tight to the building. Louther emphasized that the upper band on the building was the same corrugated metal as utilized on the gas island canopy, in addition to providing a wainscot brick base treatment along the front and east end elevation of the building, with a corner return of the brick on the west end elevation of the building up to the fenced trash enclosure. Following the presentation, the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- Issue with site lighting yet to be addressed, yet to be resolved. Louther indicated that a revised site lighting, photometric plan and cut sheets would be provided with further consideration.
- The landscape plan is improved.
- Concerns have been raised by neighbors with light glare and visibility due to the raised height of the gas island canopy. Consider raising height of the building to reduce light source view.
- Replace the lilac shrub planting with a full sized canopy tree.

ACTION:

On a motion by Host-Jablonski, seconded by March, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-1) with Barrett voting no. The motion required that the applicant address the following:

- Need to provide a revised site lighting and photometric plan that resolves previous issues with hot spots. Footcandle levels should be less than 20.
- Address concerns relevant to window fenestration, patterning and articulation, as well as lack of color and architecture with the proposed structure.

- Look at window treatment, canopy and upper façade treatment, integration of canopy structure and columns with building, as well as looking at different color palettes, in addition to building height and architecture.

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 3, 4, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5.5, and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 2801 University Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	4	5	3	-	5	4	4
	3	2	3	3	-	2	1	3
	6	4	6	-	-	5	5	5
	6.5	3	7	3	-	-	-	5.5
	6	7	8	-	-	5	6	6
	6	4	6	3	3	5	5	4
	6	4	6	2	5	6	6	5
	5	4	6	4	-	-	-	5
	6	5	6	-	-	5	5	5

General Comments:

- Building still needs lots of improvement so it at least matches other commercial development in area.
- This is an extremely disappointing project for such a prominent street. At a minimum, the lights should be blocked from the apartments behind.
- Site plan is acceptable. “Architecture” needs more thought. Consider using color.
- Landscape planting much improved. Building design and detailing is still a long way from acceptable, however, we need to see considerable improvement, not minor tweaks.
- OK for a gas station.
- “Stripes” of materials do not work well (nothing dynamic).
- Good effort to increase the landscape area and unifying the site materials. Need to revise the lighting. Increase size to a shade tree.
- Thanks for the improvements since last time.