DRAFT

AGENDA # 1

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: April 2, 2014

TITLE: 3009 University Avenue & 3118 Harvey Street – Site Improvements, Construction of Carports and Change of Parking Facilities Layout in UDD No. 6. 5th Ald. Dist. (32820)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED: **POF:**

DATED: April 2, 2014

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Richard Slayton, Melissa Huggins, Cliff Goodhart, Dawn O'Kroley, Lauren Cnare and John Harrington.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 28, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of site improvements located at 3009 University Avenue and 3118 Harvey Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Bill Dunlop, Duke Dykstra, Russ Owens and Ald. Shiva Bidar-Sielaff, District 5. Dunlop gave a short presentation on the site context and explained the need for the addition of a fire lane as they have been cited by the Fire Department, the removal of a garage and the construction of carports. The only thing visible from University Avenue is a light pole, which will be removed and replaced with plantings. Colors will blend into the existing vegetation. Improvements to the site itself are constrained by the size of the site; they have tried to do these improvements with the minimal amount of paving. Additional vegetation has been added to screen the parking primarily from Schmidt and a little bit from the views through the building. The colors of the building were used to blend into the landscaping. There are no real changes to the geometry of the site besides the additional vegetative screening in some areas. Roof materials samples were shown.

Matt Tucker, Zoning Administrator gave a brief background to the project; he started working with Duke Dykstra on this project in 2010. They worked with abutting property owners to be sure non-reflective materials and downlighting was introduced inside the carports. The Zoning Board of Appeals did grant a variance for the project, followed-up with an alteration to the conditional use that applies to this residential mixed-use building, which was allowable under the old Zoning Code. The access point underneath the building is not acceptable to the Fire Department, therefore Dykstra purchased the extra piece of property in order to have that required access. This involves utilization of the new Zoning Code which allows for these changes and a new conditional use approval will lie over the entire site. Because it goes through the long process of going through the Plan Commission and Common Council rather than an alteration process with a zoning variance, it goes through all of the processes, bringing it to the Urban Design Commission. It does also need a zoning variance once this is completed.

Ald. Bidar-Sielaff spoke in support of the changes to the property. They have held neighborhood meetings and conversations with nearby neighbors. People have been really satisfied with what the property owner wants to do here and do feel it's an improvement over what is there now.

Comments and questions from the Commission are as follows:

- That gate does not belong. I think you talked about the layout of this backing out of stalls against the corner. I don't see this as being a long-term solution, I think this is going to break down pretty fast. There are better structures out there, something more aesthetics. The trees aren't just there for aesthetics, they're there for urban heat island impacts and this isn't going to help one bit. There's no resolve to the stormwater management issues you have.
    - We have gone through the review and we are meeting the stormwater requirements. We have storage on the Harvey Street side, this structure will be replaced and will meet requirements.

  I think this could be a better project. I like the direction and the improvements but I don't think the improvements are existential. I think the gate doesn't help.
- Is this "the gate" or do you have other options? There is an issue with actual design of the gate.
    - There are many other options for gates. We could actually do a cedar one to match the cedar fencing we're putting up. Bear in mind it's going to be padlocked all the time. We talked about some type of metal slat gate, that's less maintenance, there's fiberglass. We're willing to work with City staff on a gate that is acceptable. The gate is way back on the site and is not part of the neighborhood street, it's not out by the road.

  The applicant should work with staff on an acceptable gate design that provides screening and still meet the Fire Department's criteria.
- The Secretary noted that the Commission had previously asked the design team to look at different options for designing of the shelters.
- Tell me about the durability of this material for the garages.
    - There is a concrete barrier at the ends of the aisles so that no one could actually drive into the carports from this drive aisle, and it provides a better location for plowing snow. Then we have a concrete wall along the sides that goes up 30". The steel posts are spaced 4-feet in from the end, which increases the drive aisle from 24-feet to 32-feet, which allows cars a better turning radius and helps with protection of people pulling in and out of the drive aisles. The stalls are 9-foot stalls so they would accommodate pretty much any size vehicle out there. They're 18-feet deep, we feel very comfortable that they are large enough for people to move around.
- I recall last time the slopes of the roofs were mentioned as being conflicting, particularly if you were to drive in the fire lane road, the two single loaded structures, the roofs are kind of hitting each other. Did you look at the view from the Fire Department access lane, having that be all the low side?
    - We wanted to pitch the snow and rain toward the less traveled area instead of dumping everything that we can into the drive aisles. We also went with a gable style roof instead of shed roof because of the height, with a too tall pitch if we did all shed roofs so they would all match then the roof would be 14-feet high at the high point and would be harder to hide it. We wanted to try and match some of the other roofs in the neighborhood. We're going to put snow guards on the roof to keep snow and ice from sliding off. We have looked at different roof layouts, but this gable style gives us the lowest profile and helps with stormwater drainage. When you're on Harvey Street you're about 8-feet higher than the lot itself, so really the only thing you're going to see is the tops of the roofs.
- One thing to take from this situation, we're dealing with a building that was built under a previous zoning code and having to address issues as best you can. For me, the most important thing that I've heard is that you've met with the neighborhood, you have the support of neighbors, you clearly have the support of staff and the Alder, and in a perfect world if we could have something fabulous and beautiful, that would be great. I think you're tucked back here enough, you're meeting the needs of the Fire Department, I feel like we just need to not get hung up on this and be thankful that you have the perseverance to stick with this since 2010.

- Are there ways do some different landscaping within the parking lot itself because everything seems to be more perimeter oriented.
    - (Secretary) The problem is this is a parking lot that never conformed to even the old code. It becomes basically structured parking. All the issues that were brought up, we brought up last time: landscaping, backing up issue, reduce the amount of impervious, more landscaping interior and peripheral, look into stormwater management, potential roof trays.
    - We pretty much landscaped everything we can without losing any parking stalls. We're also trying to screen the views from University Avenue.
- (Secretary) I would suggest they do something with the gate/fence. It can be more than just a locked fence, it can provide some screening.
    - (Ald. Bidar-Sielaff) This is really tucked back, it's an existing building, but if you want to add to your motion that they will work with staff to get some direction on what that gate will look like, it does have to meet the requirements of the Fire Department. The neighborhood really wants that gate to make sure this doesn't become an actual driveway. Something more visually appearing would be good.
- Going back to the different pitches, why not just flat with a membrane, that's as low profile as you could get. The roofs could be flat or be more shallow in pitch and include more consistent orientation of roofs as they relate to the site.
    - You'd get a lot of snow build-up, which increases the structure. We wanted to keep the roofs as low as possible while being able to shed snow and ice fairly easily, rather than a flat roof which would require interior drainage, a beefier structure to carry the load of the snow, the snow wouldn't melt as easily because it's in a flat plane. The neighbors would not have any shading from the reflecting of the snow.

You have gutters and snow guards, right?

- Yes.

So you're holding the snow on the roof until it melts into the gutters, and with a flat roof you could do a tapered hip and have gutters on all four sides and just let it melt. Flat roof with tapered insulation that gives it a little bit of positive drainage.

- So a shallower pitched roof?

Basically. Just like the building has a flat roof.

- We can certainly look at shallowing up the roofs, but as we said nobody is going to see it except the people that live there, and I don't know that it's going to add any value. But we could look at it if that's the deal-breaker.

I can't imagine it would cost that much. You're holding all that snow anyway. You've got beams at the ridge lines, I can't imagine it would be that much additional structure to have it consistent everywhere. You've still got the dark color and you can control the run-off.

- That's only a 15-year life span versus a 50-year life span. It's going to cost the owner more to have to re-roof sooner rather than later.

- I have a question about the minimum number of parking stalls. This is what the code requires them to put in?
    - (Tucker) There's a code requirement that you provide parking stalls relative to residential uses, but there's also a requirement that says you don't have to provide any parking. It's one of these new enhancements in our Zoning Code that doesn't necessarily have a parking minimum. In general our conversations have been about maintaining the number of parking stalls that were necessary relative to the number of units. There's a minimum but there's no minimum in the commercial corridor transition district that this falls in. But that doesn't mean you can't have any parking. This is something the Plan Commission looks at when you don't want to provide parking but you still want the building improvements because you create demands of the

neighborhood for on-street parking. It's in the range of what we would expect to see but technically there is no minimum.
    - (Ald. Bidar-Sielaff) This is one of the reasons the neighborhood supports this, because it does not mean a loss of street parking. Harvey Street already has issues with commuter parking.
- I think this is environmentally wrong. I can't support this.
- Is there any consideration for compact parking stalls?
    - That's a consideration. There is a possibility of adding some.

  How are you getting your snow to where you're storing it? These bike stalls here, can those be put where the green is, so there's a strip of green between this parking and the bike parking (westerly side of parking/carport area), and can we put 2 or 3 trees along there, and then over here (easterly side of parking/carport area)designate these as compact stalls so instead of 18-feet perhaps they're 16-feet, which allows a green strip here with trees, you may have to order a different size deck for this area but that starts to soften the size of the carport structures. These modifications could go to staff.
    - This little piece of land that separates the condo area from this parking lot, it could be pulled back, but putting a green space there it doesn't screen anything, I don't know what it solves.
- Adjustments reduce the amount of pavement you have (on the westerly side of parking/carport area); it's not a screening issue.
- If both of those are small car sections, you get a green space where maybe some trees can help reduce the heat island over there. And again, if you're flipping that greenspace to get trees in there, you have some effect on the heat island as well. Shade trees, not ornamentals. You could also get some trees in the drop-off area that would help as well.
- Part of what we're looking at is the urban island heat effect. It's not just an aesthetic thing. There's a good solution here to narrow it up and get some more trees in here. I'm not convinced you need a drop-off here. There's things you could do to make this a more functional, more green space that you've got here.

ACTION:

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Cnare, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided staff approval of the following:

- Work with staff on an acceptable gate design (more aesthetic gate/screen).
- Increase greenspace and tree coverage, decrease impervious surfaces, to return to staff for approval.
- Look at the flat roof or lower pitch options to better achieve the low profile of the site.
- Reduce the amount of paving around the existing tree in the drop-off area to provide for its continued growth and maintenance.