

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: August 12, 2015

TITLE: 5235 High Crossing Boulevard – Planned Multi-Use Site for Retail Outlot Development. 17th Ald. Dist. (39093)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: August 12, 2015

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Tom DeChant, John Harrington, Cliff Goodhart, Richard Slayton and Lois Braun-Oddo.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 12, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a Planned Multi-Use site for retail outlot development located at 5235 High Crossing Boulevard. Appearing on behalf of the project were Dan Bertler, representing Walsh Properties; Justin Frahm, representing JSD Professional Services, Inc.; and David Walsh. The site has been empty for three years. They are proposing to build an outlot and improve the conditions of the area. Parking access, circulation and connection to the right-of-way helped to drive the layout of the development. The building will accommodate 3-4 tenants with 2,500-5,000 square feet for potential end cap space with potential family entertainment uses and restaurant/pub with outdoor seating. The panel system will be concealed by fasteners. Cooler colors over earth tones and anodized aluminum windows will be used, along with stone or brick with the goal of doing a high end finish. The landscape plan pays special attention especially to the corner at High Crossing Boulevard. The Secretary noted that the letter of intent did not specify exact building materials and colors, in addition to the lack of colored elevations with shadow lines, along with a lighting and photometric plan, both of which are required for final approval based on application requirements. The Planning Division staff report specified that the Urban Design Commission shall take careful note of the landscape plan and whether or not it is sufficient.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- You’ve got a great opportunity for more tree plantings. A real tree that provides shade. Crabapples do not provide shade and the branches will be in the way when you get out of your car.
- I know you’re tight on parking, but you could put more trees in and either lose a stall or make a couple of compact car parking spots. It needs to be more green.
- You’ve got a nice project going. You could take a vine, Honey Locusts, start to create a nice feeling. You’ve got a lot of potential here but it needs more.
- Infill on this site with building is great and it should absolutely enliven the area. Is there a way with the topography and change in grade from parking elevation to building elevation, that the building could actually meet the sidewalk elevation? Maybe not always, but in some areas. This kind of retaining wall

perimeter makes the building feel kind of off putting to the public. Granted we understand this isn't going to be your active retail frontage in this area, it will likely be from the parking side, but is there a way that the building can meet the grade in some elevations as opposed to always having a retaining wall?

- We have such a huge elevation difference from the sidewalk to the original parking lot, and we get into ADA issues at that point.
- Finished floor in the building is at 946. And then at the sidewalk elevation you're about 940-941 and you taper off as you go to the corner.
- Let's say where you're 940 (grade), that would be like a 4-foot plinth or base of a building, maybe at that corner the building can come down to grade so we can try to eliminate some of the retaining.
 - We looked at extending that foundation wall and that would reduce the effective height.
- If you created at street level what would be a plaza area, for seasonal activities, you could put displays in here. All of the sudden it will attract people. Like the displays they put at Greenway Station. Right now this is somewhat of a wasteland, and you're bringing life to it, and it might need a little promotion like that. It's inviting you in at a level that you're already at.
- Would you be willing to substitute this, which is kind of a residential product, for a wider profile metal panel, where you're representing the hardiplank? Maybe in a light bronze to keep it consistent and more of a commercial material.
- I would like to see where you intentionally will tell tenants that they'll be able to put gas and electrical meters. It's a reality but they're often along the back, and if there's a design zone where those will have to go I'd like to be able to see where those are.
- This is a really nice detail, how this keeps coming back. It is important if you're going to raise these areas up, that they do continue all the way across the roof as you're representing them now. I know it's more expensive to do it that way, but that's what we're seeing. But there will be rooftop units there, so we'll want to know what type of material you plan to use for the screen walls.
- I would suggest the stone but not in a rustic texture. Could you do it in a smooth texture? You have a really nice clean, slick building and to not have that rustic base on it could really be handsome. Especially around these corners.
- The same for the retaining wall, it looks rustic.
 - There's a boulder wall there now. Probably a more linear limestone would be more appropriate.
- We do have concerns about the back of the house situation and its appearance. You need to think about how your interior spaces work so that doesn't happen.
- The contrast of the warm and cool volumes is successful. You might want to look at egress, a stair off the backside, which could be tied in with the stone base.

ACTION:

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion noted the need to provide colored and rendered elevations with shadow lines and building materials labeled, modified per the discussion, along with a lighting and photometric plan including elevational details to match those depicted in the renderings and address of landscape/grading comments, in addition to adding one bay of parking into the site plan.

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 rating for this project is 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 5235 High Crossing Boulevard

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

General Comments:

- Landscape lacking plants, particularly large canopy trees. Needs shade and scale.
- Create more of an oasis with major trees and placemaking!
- Do not use crabapple adjacent to parking stalls.