

## **AGENDA # 4**

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

|  |                                |
|--|--------------------------------|
| <b>REPORT OF:</b> URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION  | <b>PRESENTED:</b> May 21, 2008 |
| <b>TITLE:</b> 3001 South Stoughton Road – New Construction for a Commercial Building in UDD No. 1. 16 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (09860) | <b>REFERRED:</b>               |
|  | <b>REREFERRED:</b>             |
|  | <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>          |
| <b>AUTHOR:</b> Alan J. Martin, Secretary   | <b>ADOPTED:</b>                |
|  | <b>POF:</b>                    |
| <b>DATED:</b> May 21, 2008   | <b>ID NUMBER:</b>              |

---

Members present were: Bonnie Cosgrove, Marsha Rummel, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Todd Barnett and Bruce Woods.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of May 21, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of new construction located at 3001 South Stoughton Road. Appearing on behalf of the project was Jerry Bourquin, project architect. Prior to the presentation Acting Chair Bruce Woods stated the Commission’s previous comments on the project with an informational presentation held on April 9, 2008. As a follow-up Bourquin noted the following modifications to the plan.

- A review of traffic planning at the rear details the functional need for pavement at the areas where pavement may be reduced.
- Infiltration areas are provided adjacent to wetland areas with the roof pitched back to accommodate the flow of rainwater.

Following a review of the various plan details and building elevations including material pallet and colors the Commission noted the following:

- The planting scheme for the large parking lot should be more innovative. Suggest the use of hackberry instead of honey locust as well as concern with the use of swamp white oak. Instead of lawn areas consider planting beds with low shrubs or ground covers, other alternatives to reduce maintenance.
- Use of crabapple around surface parking; too low risk injury to cars, need to be major deciduous trees; two large trees for every four crabapple trees.
- Cut honey locust use in half. Eliminate spirea use; favor ornamental grasses or alternative.
- Way too much pavement. Need to see alternative as previously requested.
- Place employment parking to the rear. Modify front surface parking to be single loaded.
- Carve down as much pavement as possible in the rear. Look at concentrating loading to the right side of the rear of the building; eliminate pavement and drive aisle off of the left rear corner of the building.
- Issue with the drive aisle connector loop on the side off of the easterly corner of the building. Not necessary. Excessive amount of pavement.

- An issue with a number of parking stalls provided for the range of proposed uses. The level could be brought down.
- Eliminate southeast drive aisle lane and bank single loaded surface parking stalls adjacent to this area in order to enlarge green buffer at corner combined with existing and proposed landscaping as well as utilization of the possible infiltration basin; that feeds back into adjacent wetlands.
- Relevant to architecture not sure extra tall parapet on the bookends.
- The proportions of the vertical pilasters at corners are out of scale including the portion of the cornices.
- Canopies ought to be lower with the curving on canopy elements too steep.
- Question the use of two different awning types; combine individual adjoining curved canopies at bookends into one.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0). The motion for referral required address of the above stated concerns, as well as the previously stated concerns within the report of April 9, 2008 relevant to reduction of pervious pavement especially the rear, movement of employee parking to the back side combined with reduction parking in the front, provide a green edge in front of the building, the banking of parking stalls for future use to allow the diminished number of parking and the combined grouping of contiguous stalls to create larger 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 ratings for this project are 4, 5, 5, 5 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 3001 South Stoughton Road**

|                       | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <b>Member Ratings</b> | -         | -            | -              | -                              | -     | -                                   | -             | 5              |
|                       | 3         | 5            | 5              | 4                              | -     | 5                                   | 5             | 4              |
|                       | 4         | 5            | 4              | -                              | -     | 4                                   | 5             | 5              |
|                       | 4         | 5            | 4              | -                              | -     | 5                                   | 6             | 5              |
|                       | 4         | 5            | 3              | -                              | -     | 5                                   | 4             | -              |
|                       | 6         | 6            | 5              | -                              | -     | 6                                   | -             | 6              |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |
|                       |           |              |                |                                |       |                                     |               |                |

General Comments:

- Address/reduce impervious surfaces and enhance landscaping.
- Site design requires much work.
- Need to resolve the landscape, site plan issues. Consider removing loop of pavement.
- Over reliance on pavement. Landscape material is weak.
- Incorporate more native shrubs/perennials (delete spirea). Omit crabapples at parking (safety issue).