

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

|   |   |
|---|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION  | <b>PRESENTED:</b> March 26, 2008                                |
| TITLE: 1209 Deming Way – RPSM Parking<br>Variance. 9 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (02291) | <b>REFERRED:</b><br><b>REREFERRED:</b><br><b>REPORTED BACK:</b> |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary   | <b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>                                     |
| DATED: March 26, 2008   | <b>ID NUMBER:</b>   |

---

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Marsha Rummel, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Bonnie Cosgrove and Jay Ferm.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of March 26, 2008, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of an RPSM parking variance located at 1209 Deming Way. Appearing on behalf of the project were Andrew Van Haren representing The Gialamas Co., and Tom Starkweather representing Planning Design Build, Inc. Prior to the presentation staff noted the provisions of the R.P.S.M. Research Park – Specialized Manufacturing District relevant to allowing for surface parking located in an area between the front or side of the building and the required front or side yard setback as follows: “A parking lot containing not more than ten (10) parking spaces may be located to the front or side of a building, but not in any required front yard or in the required street side yard on a corner lot. If approved by the Urban Design Commission a parking lot containing more than ten (10) parking spaces may be located in the front or side of a building, but not in any required front yard or any required street side yard on a corner lot.” The project as proposed provides for the development of 73-stall surface parking lot addition located between the front and side yard setback and the existing building. Van Haren then presented details of the proposed parking lot addition providing for references to the function of the proposed parking in regards to the site’s tenant, Tomo Therapy Manufacturing. He noted that the combination of the existing and proposed parking provides that the total number of parking stalls would be a little above that minimum required under provisions of the zoning code. He further elaborated the need to locate the parking within the area between the front and side yard setback and building due to the location of the manufacturing facility at the rear of the site based on sensitivity to its manufacturing functions providing for only the development of parking at the building’s front.

Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Modify the parking lot plan to combine two stalls at the center of the parking bays abutting Deming Way and the property’s side yard to provide the addition of an enlarged tree islands in addition to incorporating an end-to-end tree island at the center of the parking lot addition.
- Modify the landscape plan to use a major tree along Deming Way to not obscure the view corridor.

Narrow the opening to the fire lane drive entry utilizing multiple curves along the south elevation. Keep all ground plantings under 3-feet along Deming Way.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Harrington, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1). With Host-Jablonski voting no. The motion required address of the above stated comments relevant to the fire access drive, landscaping, and entry 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 5, 5, 5, 5, 5 and 5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1209 Deming Way**

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

General Comments:

- Unfortunate parking requirement.
- The additional islands will help soften the area.
- Parking needs more interior landscaping to provide the “park-like” setting desired.
- Be mindful of limited sight distances on Deming Way when planting at curve; use major deciduous trees only.
- RPSM goals have been ignored here, resulting in vast parking in the front.