

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | |
|--|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | PRESENTED: August 9, 2006 |
| TITLE: 5901 Odana Road – Demolition and New Construction of an Auto Dealership in Urban Design District No. 3. 19 th Ald. Dist. (04007) | REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK: |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary | ADOPTED: POF: |
| DATED: August 9, 2006 | ID NUMBER: |

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Acting Chair; Michael Barrett, Todd Barnett, Lisa Geer, Ald. Noel Radomski and Cathleen Feland.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 9, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of demolition and new construction of an auto dealership in Urban Design District No. 3 located at 5901 Odana Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Tom Knoop, Attorney Michael Christopher, Jeremy Holmstadt, James Budinetz, J.R. Smart, Jim Triatik and Maurice Adams III. The plans as presented featured the following in response to the Commission's previous review of the project:

- The address of concerns by both the Traffic Engineer and Fire Department. The lighting plan features fully shielded lighting fixtures at lower light levels.
- The landscape plan provides for additional plantings at the base of the building and along the streetscape, in addition to the use of pervious pavers in two bays of surface parking within the inventory storage area.
- A review of the building elevations and materials provide for the use of Lucabond panels and glass with EIFS on portions of the upper elevation and precast at the base.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- An issue with an internally lit wall displaying signage composed of frosted glass as being a sign or an architectural element. Staff noted that the east elevation containing this feature also had issue with multiple signable that may not be consistent with the code.
- The inventory area utilizing pervious pavers is not designed to pick up much water, the drainage needs to be modified to provide for this function.
- Need sample and details of the dumpster enclosure.
- The lighting and photometric plan features spill over of light on adjoining neighboring properties, inconsistent with the code requirements.
- Concern with the 90% lot coverage with impermeable surface; need a strategy for more onsite infiltration.
- Need strategy for tree island infiltration, infiltration of pervious paver area with integration into an overall stormwater plan provided. The onsite infiltration is insufficient to meet existing requirements;

need civil engineer to address treatment of grease and sediments as part of an overall stormwater management plan.

- Provide detailed information on the percent of stormwater handled onsite versus off-site.
- Concern with the amount of impervious area on site without an option for treatment onsite.
- Some of the tree islands not provided with any landscaping or the required 75% vegetative cover.
- The requirements for Urban Design District No. 3 requires address of landscaping and screening issues on the periphery of the site, as well as internally to the site. The landscape plan falls short of addressing the “Landscape; Requirements as follows:” landscaping shall be used for a functional as well as decorative purpose, including framing desirable views, screening unattractive features and views along the roadway, screening different uses from each other and complementing the architectural massing of the building. In addition, it was noted that the screening requirements relevant to parking and service areas; the need to provide for effective landscaping and screening unaddressed with the proposal.
- Need more landscaping to meet the requirements of Urban Design District No. 3, also issue with the points calculation within the landscape worksheet for the site relative to the amount of total landscaping required, specifically canopy trees under the code as applied. The applicant noted that, to their knowledge, the portions of the site were exempt from the parking/landscaping requirements.
- Issue with the amount of paving and pervious area, a significant urban design issue.
- Providing trees within parking lot islands are not within conflict with the site’s use.
- Provide landscaping in the amount of points required for 522 parking stalls according to provisions of the Zoning Code.

Following discussion by the Commission, Maurice Adams, a member of the family owning the adjacent parcel to the west raised several concerns relevant to landscaping and screening along their common lot line with the facility. Discussion on the issues between the applicant and the Commission emphasized the issue of whether or not automobile parking lots were exempt from the standard regulations applying to all parking lots within the Zoning Code; the Commission requested that further consideration of the project would require an opinion of the Zoning Administrator regarding this issue. Staff stated its belief that a policy relevant to a reduced level of landscaping within an automobile dealership’s parking area was more of a policy inconsistent with the requirements of the code. Staff further stated that the provisions for Urban Design District No. 3 provided substantial support for landscaping and screening, both interior and exterior to the site for a property located within the urban design district without reliance on the provisions of the Zoning Code. Several members of the Commission reiterated the need of a ruling on the requirements for inventory parking versus a standard parking lot on how the landscaping points requirements are applied.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barrett, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (6-0). The motion required address of the above and the following:

- Provide detailed information as to the address of the NR51 requirements relevant to grease, settlement, salt and other requirements with redesign of the overall stormwater management plan to provide for more onsite infiltration.
- The overall landscaping shall be increased with a significant reflection in points to meet the requirements of a development within an urban design district, along with providing additional landscaping and screening on the easterly and westerly perimeters of the site and elimination of light spillage on adjacent properties as required by code.

- Need to address issues as previously raised within the previous review of the project (June 28, 2006), as well as with the current consideration of the project.
- Need to provide fixture cutsheets.
- Provide a determination by the Zoning Administrator as to the full applicability of the requirements for screening and landscaping of parking lots as it effects the development of an automobile storage area on this site.

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, 5.5, 5.5 and 5.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 5901 Odana Road

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Member Ratings | 6 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 5.5 |
| | 5 | 6 | 5 | - | - | - | - | 5.5 |
| | 5 | 6 | 4 | 5 | - | - | 6 | 5 |
| | 6 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 4.5 |
| | 3 | 7.5 | - | - | - | - | - | 5.5 |
| | 4 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Stormwater, landscaping, site drainage is still of serious concern.
- Nice building – site plan needs shading at inventory area.
- Clarify, in writing, with Zoning and Planning Departments the critical question about the inventory parking. Improve landscaping plan for UDD No. 3 and modify drainage strips to take advantage of the slope; consider plantings in the islands. Tweak lighting plan.
- Does not provide enough opportunities for infiltration or sediment control for the amount of impervious area. The screening and landscape requirement does not address the inventory parking lot areas. We need an interpretation from Zoning as to how the parking lot ordinance applies to this application. It is not enough landscaping for a development in an Urban Design District; more screening along the side yards.
- This project can and should do more to infiltration stormwater much better. Also, needs trees.
- This is an Urban Design District. As such, it must exceed basic zoning requirements.