

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: November 28, 2012

TITLE: 1129 South Park Street – Demolition to Construct New Gas Station/Convenience Store in UDD No. 7. 13<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (23443)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: November 28, 2012

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, John Harrington, Melissa Huggins, Richard Slayton, Cliff Goodhart and Tom DeChant.

**SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of November 28, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of demolition to construct a new gas station/convenience store located at 1129 South Park Street. Appearing on behalf of the project was John W. Sutton, the project architect. Appearing and speaking in opposition was Mark Schoendoref. Sutton presented updates to the project, including the current removal of tanks and site remediation. Transoms are included over all the punched windows and at the entrances. The hollow metal has been changed to clear anodized aluminum storefront. The bus stop has been moved. The Japanese Spirea has been changed to Weigela Minuet as border plantings edging the site.

Mark Schoendoref spoke as a resident behind the project, with about 10-feet between the back of this gas station property and his property. He is generally opposed to the project. He sees approval as supporting a large investment into a concept that is not generally feasible for this property. If somebody bought an empty lot to develop a gas station, the lot is too small and there is City ordinance that says you cannot have a gas station within 25-feet of a residential property. Other things to note would be that City Engineering and Traffic Engineering oppose this project due to the traffic patterns. He has seen lots of accidents at that intersection due to the fact that people want to get in and out of the gas station. He expressed concerns with pedestrian access, chemicals going into the storm sewer and car lights shining on his house because of the large grade change between properties. The property currently has three different types of fencing with chain link vinyl being proposed; this does nothing to prohibit sound traveling to the adjacent residential properties.

The Chair responded that the question of use is not before this body. That is a Plan Commission issue if there were a change in use. The Secretary added that the fencing material will have to be much more durable and more aesthetic. Sutton responded that it would be a wood fence. He also responded that the grade change is about 6-feet. The tower is screened from the residential side so there is no light spilling that way. Several Commissioners responded that many of the plans submitted were illegible.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- There were some planned intersection changes. Will those occur simultaneously?
  - They're not going to happen now. At this point they don't think that they're going to happen. There had been a change in Traffic. The person who was pushing for the median strip here died. They're not going to make it a condition of approval for this. We are reducing the size of one of the entries.
- I have concerns about the sidewalk with cars parked here; you're right at that sidewalk. It's very close.
- The landscape plan is not acceptable as far as I'm concerned. A lot of these ground covers are not going to look good year-round. It needs to be rethought and it needs to be readable.
- I'd like to see the actual color and texture of the concrete block since it's predominantly a masonry building. I don't have any problem with the design but there's missing information. And the plans were really difficult to read.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0).

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 3, 5, 5 and 6.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1129 South Park Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	3	4	3	-	-	2	3	3
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	6	6	5	-	6	5	7	6
	5	6	5	-	-	4	8	5

General Comments:

- Need material, lighting, fencing information and legible plans.
- Initial version much better. Overall design nice, but details...