

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: June 29, 2016

TITLE: 109 South Fair Oaks Avenue – PD(GDP-SIP), Adaptive Restoration and Reuse of the Historic Garver Feed Mill Including Micro-Lodging, an Olbrich Storage Building and Gardens. 6th Ald. Dist. (38227)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: June 29, 2016

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner*, Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Michael Rosenblum, Lois Braun-Oddo, Tom DeChant, Sheri Carter and Richard Slayton*.

*Slayton acted as Chair.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 29, 2016, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PD(GDP-SIP) for the adaptive restoration and reuse of the historic Garver Feed Mill located at 109 South Fair Oaks Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Bryant Moroder, Lou Host-Jablonski, Tom Rogers and Adam Voltz, representing Baum Development.

Approximately 50 micro lodges will be installed, the designs of which are still being narrowed down.

The adopted policy of the Commission requires prototypical designs in order to grant final approval, as well as landscape designs. SIP level is a detailed level of approval. There are discrepancies in the renderings, issues as to how the venting and HVAC will be handled, a lack of micro-lodge details and landscape plans.

Staff noted specific conditions as contained in Heather Stouder’s Planning Division report as follows:

1. Final plans submitted for review and approval by staff shall include a phasing plan demonstrating that clearly shows the rehabilitation of the Garver Feed Mill building in the first phase of the site build-out, and describes the intended phasing of the storage building, the micro-lodge subareas, urban agriculture components, and other site improvements.
2. The applicant shall submit the following supplemental items to the UDC for consideration of *final approval* of the design to include:
 - a) Photometric plans, scaled to be legible on 11” by 17” paper.
 - b) Detailed landscape plans, consistently labeled and scaled to be legible on 11” by 17” paper.
 - c) Colored and rendered building elevations, with shadow lines.
 - d) Details on the building materials and colors for the unheated storage building.

- e) Details for HVAC units, venting, and rooftop equipment associated with the Garver building.
- f) At least two (2) prototypical designs (elevations and floor plans) for the micro-lodges, and a prototypical landscape plan for each micro lodge pod area.
- g) Narrative describing the process desired by the applicant for staff review and approval of the micro-lodges. The narrative shall include acknowledgement that staff may elect to involve the UDC and/or Landmarks Commission in the review at any time deemed necessary by staff.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The Landmarks Commission recommended no screening of rooftop HVAC. When you come back we'll need to see the elevations of what that non-screened HVAC is going to look like, because that's unusual.
 - One of the things that will have to be worked out on this project is what exactly doesn't get screened and what does, because it is embedded in the Zoning Code that you screen. I don't think it's Landmarks' vision that a bit air handler is going to be unscreened, maybe a chimney or an industrial type. These things will be worked out.
- We need to see how the transition of landscaping works from one area to another.
 - There is planting that gives a break, it's more in some areas and less in others. For instance, by the orchard there are 2 pods that really relate to one another, the way they're laid out. Where when we transition we're divided by a space where there might be a hedge that separates those two areas.
- When you do the prototypical you have to portray that to some degree so what you're describing verbally is being seen, at least in concept. We need enough information, otherwise we don't know the relationship between the different layers at all without some definition.
- Representative species for each zone and each pod type.
- I would suggest that these prototypes come in as these zones or pods are developed. Maybe you have two buildings and a landscaping plan prototypical of each one of them. A landscaped theme for each cluster. You have to explain how they're all different and have a different character related to their landscape design.
- How does the landscaping relate to the contemporary pod? A more traditional building form might have foundation plantings that would relate to that traditional look, where with a contemporary building, it would be incorrect to use foundation plantings.
- We really want and need clarity as to what the design approach is.
- Staff on each one of these pods can approve these things as they go without having to come back here.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Rosenblum, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0).