

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: March 7, 2007

TITLE: 4622 East Washington Avenue –
Demolition and New Construction of a
Retail/Commercial Building in Urban
Design District No. 5. 17th Ald. Dist.
(05673)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: March 7, 2007

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 7, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of demolition and new construction of a retail/commercial building in Urban Design District No. 5 located at 4622 East Washington Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Bob Feller and Alex Kalis. In response to previous comments on the project as part of an informational presentation to the Commission (February 7, 2007), the revised plans featured the following:

- The reuse of the existing building on the site proposed to be demolished, combined with its orientation, age and construction were noted as the underlying reasons for its proposed demolition.
- The incorporation of an on-site bio-retention area within a separation strip between rows and adjoining surface parking stalls has been provided, in addition to a reduction of pavement with the development of a retaining wall system around the perimeter allowing for the creation of more greenspace.
- The architecture of the building in regards to the fenestration and detailing of proposed individual tenant spaces have been simplified to provide individual but unified storefronts, including consideration for signage.
- The plaza area previously located off of the southeast corner of the building adjacent to the site's right-of-way frontage has been moved to the northeasterly corner and enlarged, combined with a reduction in surface parking along the rear (parking lot side) of the building adjacent to its north elevation.

Following the presentation, staff requested that the revised elevations be further detailed to include a material sample list. Comments by the Commission were as follows:

- The landscape worksheet points calculation incorrectly counts "tree lilacs" at 35 points each. Small trees are only 15 points each, therefore the landscape point calculations are under the required level. In addition, overall landscaping is thin and needs additions as well as change out of the over calculated trees. Switch the trees in islands (lilac) for two large canopy trees.
- Correct elevations to show brick on columns on the front elevation of the "Chipotle" tenant space.
- Resolve issue with the alignment of the doorway shown on the south elevation for the "Chipotle" tenant space as it relates to its location on the site plan relative to the patio/outdoor eating area.

- The utilization of stone mulch in islands does not meet the requirement for 75% vegetative cover required by code.
- Eliminate the EIFS segmented arch for brick.

During discussion on the project, Alex Weiss presented to the Commission an alternate site plan which featured the orientation of surface parking rows perpendicular to the proposed buildings as an alternative to the parallel orientation previously presented. Weiss noted that this option provided for more parking, at the same time maintaining the open space around the perimeter of the site. In response to the alternate plan, the Commission noted the following:

- The flipping of the parking orientation presents issues with drainage into the bioswales; walking through the bioretention areas, as well as pedestrian access through the surface parking lot.
- If parking orientation is switched, it is necessary to create curb cuts into the beds and change species of trees in regards to water tolerancy, in addition to providing for additional tree islands because surface parking stall runs are too long, in addition to a revised grading and landscape plan also needs to be provided.

ACTION:

On a motion by Geer, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with March and Barrett voting no. The motion to refer was based on consideration of the alternate site plan as presented, creating a site concept issue which required further address in regards to the configuration of the bioretention area, including the provision of curb cuts, the incorporation of additional tree islands due to uninterrupted rows of surface parking stalls, as well as a revised grading and landscape plan including site lighting to be provided with further consideration of the project.

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 5, 5.5, 6, 6, 6, 6.5 and 7.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 4622 East Washington Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	5	6	4	7	6	6	7	6
	6	7	5	6	-	6	7	6
	5	6	4	5	-	5	4	5
	6	7	5	6	-	7	7	6.5
	-	5	4	-	-	4	5	-
	5	6	4	-	-	5	6	5.5
	7	8	5	8	7	8	8	7.5

General Comments:

- Architecture fine. Landscape needs work.
- The Japanese tree lilacs are counted as shade trees on the landscape worksheet. These are considered small trees value; 15 points each. This brings you both short for required trees and points. Add more shade trees within the parking lot islands and more screening shrubs on the east and west edges also. If site plan is switched provide for more tree island planting areas than shown and curb cuts to the rain gardens.
- Return with revised/desired parking lot plan. Upgrade landscaping as discussed.
- Nicely improved. Too much pavement.
- Need to reconfigure the parking lot and improve tree count and bioretention trends.
- Site design needs further development. Building design greatly improved.