AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	**PRESENTED:** December 5, 2012
TITLE: 5225 University Avenue – Deconstruction and New Construction of a Retail Building in UDD No. 6. 19th Ald. Dist. (28183)	**REFERRED:**
	REREFERRED:
	REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	**ADOPTED:** **POF:**
DATED: December 5, 2012	**ID NUMBER:**

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 5, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of deconstruction and new construction of a retail building located at 5225 University Avenue. Appearing on behalf of the project were Joseph Krupp, and Jerry Bourquin, the project architect. Registered and speaking in opposition were Tom Degen, Jim Bricker, JSD Professional Services, representing the adjoining property owners; and Michael Kienitz. Registered neither in support nor opposition were Herman Felstehausen and Ald. Mark Clear, District 19. The Secretary noted that the parking lot landscaping does not meet the UDD No. 6 guidelines. Staff noted that the building demolition and scrapping of the entire site combined with a new building/development plan should be an opportunity to provide sufficient landscaping around the site especially parking around its perimeter. Bourquin addressed the Commission's comments from their previous meeting. The possibility of angled parking caused the back-up to decrease to about 12-feet and affected the loop which would not accommodate delivery trucks, garbage trucks or larger vehicles. Building materials are a mix of metals and burnished block masonry, with a small area of EIFS above the stone for signage. Infiltration areas were shown; there is a storm sewer that runs along the property. There is a chain link fence that runs along the property line; there is a retaining wall that holds their grade about 3-feet higher than the Perkins parking lot. They have met with adjoining property owners about the possibility of a shared landscaping area but that was not met favorably. A no left turn sign will be installed for exiting onto University Avenue. The neighborhood is very concerned about water run-off; they are looking to create some rain gardens and increase landscaping if necessary.

Tom Degen spoke in opposition as a neighboring property owner. He has concerns about the plan, primarily that the landscape buffer is lacking, the way the project impacts the crosswalk and the traffic now and in the future. He has five cuts into this property that he would like to reduce in the future and create a major access points that lines up with Flambeau and the major curb cut. The impact of the exit from the drive-thru on the existing crosswalk is of concern; it overlaps and would eliminate the crosswalk.

Jim Bricker spoke regarding potential traffic impacts. Traffic is currently making movements it shouldn't so this area needs signage. They are hoping to create a traffic pattern with the plans. There is a large 22-foot wide concrete box clover that runs through to Spring Harbor approximately 3-4 feet below the ground surface. Landscaping in that area will be difficult. This site begs for a comprehensive look as a multi-use location.

Michael Kienitz spoke in opposition, mainly due to improper vetting of the project by the neighborhood. No one was made aware by either the developer or Ald. Clear that this first and final meeting would take place today, until the Alder sent an email at 11:32 p.m. the night before. No one was made aware that one of the proposed businesses could be operating 24 hours per day. Until this evening no one was made aware of the previous Urban Design Commission meeting for the informational presentation. Their neighborhood president was unaware that this was on the Urban Design Commission agenda. The neighborhood already has issues with the traffic, this will only increase those concerns.

Herman Felstehausen spoke as a member of the Spring Harbor Neighborhood Association. This is primarily a residential neighborhood so a commercial operation that has unusual hours, requires night lighting or has heavy traffic flow, the neighbors want to know about it and be involved in the decisions about how the project is envisioned and what its consequences might be. Secondly, the water and greenspace issues are very important to the neighborhood. Spring Harbor beach is heavily affected by the run-off. In regards to the increase of traffic in an already congested area, they have asked Joe Krupp to work with City Engineering to solve that problem. They would like communication back from the developer so that the neighborhood can be a part of the process of working out the details.

Ald. Mark Clear, District 19 spoke to comments he has received from the neighborhood. He has heard questions about the traffic flow, especially around the building, insufficient queuing area that would cause traffic back-up onto University Avenue and concerns about stormwater. He noted that this is an improvement from a completely impervious site as it is now. He also noted that Perkins restaurant next door is a 24/7 operation that does not cause problems for the neighborhood.

The Secretary noted a sign code requirement that the signs have to be below the juncture of the roof with the parapet; where the sign bands/upper parapet as designed may preclude the sign graphics as detailed and affect the building façade's upper architecture. Krupp mentioned that City Engineering was responsible for the curb cuts and circulation that came with the new University Crossing development.

Comments and questions from the Commission included the following:

- Look at the overhang on the side of the barrel; it's deeper than the overhang at the end of the barrel so it feels like it stops short, might extend.
- I would like to see run-off calculations. I also think we need to reduce the pavement and get more infiltration on that site. I'd like to see solutions to that. This "concrete desert" needs to be spruced up; increase tree canopy on site.
- I'd prefer organic mulch to stone mulch. Your landscape plan needs to be redone. I would just start over again. One is the material, you've got the same plant all the way around, you've selected short, non-screening plants. These plantings don't have much relationship. If you're going to have a patio out here have some aesthetics, make it a place where people are going to want to sit.
- Integrate planting with detention base.

ACTION:

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL.** The motion was passed on a vote of (6-2) with Slayton and Harrington voting no. The motion provided for the following:

- Come back with a better signage package.
- Redo your landscape plan to address comments.
- Work with Traffic Engineering to make sure that that is a safe exit and people can actually cross University Avenue.

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 3, 4, 4 and 4.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 5225 University Avenue

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	2	5	1	-	-	3	5	3
	6	6	4	4	4	5	6	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	4	5	3	-	-	3	4	4

General Comments:

- More tree canopy a must. Need new landscape.
- Needs work, landscape plan especially. Talk to Traffic Engineering about larger issue of Flambeau intersection. Sign package needed.