

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: August 11, 2021

TITLE: 575 Zor Shrine Place - Residential
Building Complex. 9th Ald. Dist. (65583)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Janine Glaeser, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: August 11, 2021

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Lois Braun-Oddo, Shane Bernau, Rafeeq Asad, Jessica Klehr, Christian Harper, Christian Albouras and Russell Knudson.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 11, 2021, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a Residential Building Complex located at 575 Zor Shrine Place. Registered and speaking in support were Natina James, David Stahl and Mark Laverty, all representing Saturday Properties. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Michael Jones, representing Cuningham; Carter Lanser and Jaime Perron, representing Saturday Properties.

Updates to the development have minimized parking by 24 stalls and replaced them with greenspace. The site is broken into three parcels with the north lot becoming future right-of-way. The green areas in the center will remove the parking lot and make that design more interesting. It is a fire lane and requires access through there, but it now gives rhythm and play back and forth. The north lot allows them to achieve the 1:1 per bedroom market demand parking. As car dependency reduces and the mall undergoes redevelopment, the hope is they will no longer need that parking. They will have a car sharing program with spots in the front, electrical charge stations on both lots, and indoor parking under the building, ADA parking is located adjacent to the entry closest to the ramp. Bike parking is dispersed throughout at the entries and they will add more when the future bike path connection comes through. They are exceeding the required usable open space. The perimeter to the north is now lined with trees; the large Maple will remain and they have supplemented existing with additional plantings. They are still working out details of the pavers in the proposed central usable space.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Appreciate the added detail and clarification about the Badger Alley plaza and treatment of the drive, it maximizes pedestrian use of the site. The rendering shows the brick extending out past the crosswalk into the drive, whereas the landscape plans show that brick terminate. What is the intent, and you seemed unclear, I'll ask for it to be brick instead of colored concrete.

- That's a rendering miscommunication, it will be kept just within that area for better vehicular circulation, to stop it right at the north edge. The reason I hesitate on the pavers is often with plows they can become problematic.
- We had pervious pavers on a project in Minneapolis, that is long-term a concern for us. We can work with plow companies but it is a concern and we'd be replacing pavers. We're trying to minimize that as much as we can.
- What caliper trees are we looking at? Can we expect the trees in the renderings to get this tall?
 - The City minimum is usually 1-½-2" caliper. If we want them to be successful it is best to plant smaller than larger.
 - We prefer to see renderings with mature trees to see how they work with the buildings.
- The greenspace on grade below the decks, trying to picture using that space. Wonder if you'd consider getting that space into the courtyard?
 - The courtyards are more or less 5-feet above grade where the parking and sidewalks are. We terraced down with plantings, and when you reach the sidewalk it's at a similar height. If we were to raise that up it moves that wall closer to the sidewalk, which we thought would be more uncomfortable. These courtyards are quite large so our thought was the lower portions are for looking at. We could berm it out and grade up to increase the size, but that was our starting point.
- Good to hear your intent is that it's probably more useful for looking than using. It's a consideration, I don't have a strong solution.
- The development of what you've done in the courtyards is really nice with significant investment. I've always liked the Badger Alley idea. Previously some of the concerns stemmed from best intentions; if the design doesn't lock in they don't get programmed or used as we've seen them described. The pavement is critical to that type of space. I would caution on the use of colored concrete, especially red or pink color. The paver would be a nicer investment as more of a pedestrian space.
- In general, the center spine felt designed more as a parking lot than a streetscape. The critical piece of that being parallel parking along a roadway rather than perpendicular. Suggest you consider going parallel through that center spine south of the Badger Alley plaza, but now I'm rethinking that. Could also see it being successful the way you're proposing it. Can you elaborate more on those green rectangles, is it plantings and trees?
 - Yes, it would not be essentially lawn. I'm intrigued by your parallel parking suggestion.
- You've tipped the balance with the amount of greenspace in the center. Going parallel would allow for more of a street/terrace buffer. I think you've convinced me that can be successful.
- The tree sizes: for an ornamental you should be using a 1-½ to 2" caliper, for shade or canopy trees you should be using 2-1/2" at a minimum.
- Nice building, there is a lot to like about this project. Appreciate the clarifications and changes, the added greenspace in the interior spine.

ACTION:

On a motion by Knudson, seconded by Klehr, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0).

The motion provided for an increase in the caliper size of shade/ornamental trees (not inconsistent or in conflict with code).