

AGENDA # 6

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** January 18, 2012

TITLE: 733 South Gammon Road – Demolition **REFERRED:**
 and New Construction of a **REREFERRED:**
 Retail/Commercial Building in UDD **REPORTED BACK:**
 No. 2. 1st Ald. Dist. (24586)

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

DATED: January 18, 2012 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, Melissa Huggins, John Harrington, and Henry Lufler.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of January 18, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a demolition and new construction located at 733 South Gammon Road. Appearing on behalf of the project was John Bieno, representing TJK Design Build. The modified plans feature a flat roof system to off-set the overhang and put windows at the corner. The awnings have been simplified by putting sunscreens on the windows. The drive-thru has been lowered so it is even with the parapet. Landscaping along the street has been increased. Functionally and directionally the lot stays the same. Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Instead of changing the horizontal because the symmetry is nice, did you look at one material for the corner piece?
 - I did but we chose to go this direction. It’s not something we’re opposed to if the Commission feels strongly about it.
- What would happen if the sidewalk is pushed; it seems like you’d have fewer cars at this node.
 - As you come in there will be fewer cars backed up here and that is a more natural location with the traffic slowing down.I think it would be better for safety reasons.
- Thanks for the changes to the building design. I would take this asymmetry and pull it to the windows. Look at the hierarchy of fascia.
- Did you look at shared parking? I don’t know how I could support this much parking. Staff noted previous conditions relevant to parking and pavement issues associated with initial approval of the project as follows: “The motion required that the applicant look at shared parking, parking at a 1 stall for 300 square foot ratio or reduce initially and bank stalls and revisit in 3 to 4 years or significant porous pavement and on-side drainage...”
 - We could come back and ask for additional parking based on tenants.
- Is it feasible to put a small raised crosswalk at the drive-up drive aisle crossing?

ACTION:

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0-1) with Slayton abstaining. The motion required the following:

- Banking of stalls to maintain parking levels not to exceed 1 stall per 300 square feet or the option of maintaining the northeasterly bay of 8 stalls in open space until additional parking demand could be demonstrated with staff approval.
- Provide a raised pedestrian walkway crossing the drive-up drive aisle at Gammon Road.
- The window patterns shall reflect the tower window pattern and eliminate roll lock masonry course above windows.
- Increase the landscaping around the stacked drive-up queuing drive aisle.
- Option to go with a flat block rather than split face.
- Scale down or vary canopy fascia height.
- Signage details are to return for formal approval.
- The building material color or texture needs to be consistent on vertical corners adjacent to the leftmost and center tenant space entries.

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 6, 6, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 733 South Gammon Road

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