City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT	OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: December 19, 2012		
TITLE:	1127 North Sherman Avenue (Sherman & Abarg) New Construction for the Food	REFERRED:		
	Aberg) – New Construction for the Food Enterprise & Economic Development (FEED) Kitchens Project in a Conditional	REREFERRED:		
	Use Planned Commercial Site, "Northgate" Shopping Center. 12 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (28346)	<b>REPORTED BACK:</b>		
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary		ADOPTED:	POF:	
DATED: I	December 19, 2012	ID NUMBER:		

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

## **SUMMARY**:

At its meeting of December 19, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of new construction located at 1127 North Sherman Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were John Seamon, Mark Lane and Ellen Barnard, representing the Northside Planning Council. Seamon addressed the Commission's comments from their previous review of the project. An outdoor space has been created for users of the FEED building. The landscaping has been adjusted based on the Commission's previous comments. The applicants looked at the master plan and the site itself to get a better understanding of the site and what is there from an architectural design standpoint. There are now larger parts of hardipanel with elevations showing where they are.

Satya Rhodes-Conway, District 12 Alder spoke in strong support of this project. She likes the site and sees this as a synergy and huge improvement to the site.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- This project really gets to the question of how we think about infilling parking lots.
  - This is the primary access for this site, but not the primary automobile access for the <u>entire</u> site. You have cars coming in from a number of different directions, going a number of different places and cycling through the site in a number of different ways. I do think it's correct that what's indicated here, these are the primary internal roads; we want anything that is built internally to relate to this. The ownership of this end of the site is also different from the other end, which limits us in ways the actual mall can connect to Sherman and the sidewalk there.
- I want to be sure you announce yourselves properly even if it's not the front door and I'm not sure you do that.
  - This is a destination that people will seek out. The sight line from Sherman Avenue will allow for people to see us.

- The intention of this project is to bring it to a community that it can serve and in doing that there are some constraints in terms of the facility design. That side of the building facing Sherman is service in nature. Bringing this building to this site, with all the restraints (budget) is something we're paying a lot of attention to.
- I would make your landscape simpler with two more Serviceberries and cut out Corral Berry as a ground cover or background cover of Amelancher with simple ground cover, use shredded bark mulch in base and add hopps to planting list on plan.
- The pieces need to blend and create more of a garden. I would go with the formal look.
- Try to make a simple, cohesive design. Look at shredded bark.

## ACTION:

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0). The motion provided that the landscape plan be more formal per comments made and look at alternatives to enhancing the "back of the house" appearance of the west elevation.

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, 6, 6, 7 and 7.

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	6	6	6	7	6	6	6
	2	7	6	-	-	2	5	5
	7	7	6	-	-	7	8	7
	6	7	5	-	7	6	8+	7
	6	7	5	-	_	6	6	6

General Comments:

- Much improved suggest removing fin above entrance.
- This complex site needs a decent master plan. This ad hoc development, site by site, is very bad.
- Boost the alcove of landscaping, simplify and create a cohesive landscape in this area.
- A formal and simplified planting plan will be more effective and better relate to the architecture.