

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION**PRESENTED:** February 5, 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:** February 5, 2014**ID NUMBER:**

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 5, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of site improvements and construction of carports located at 3009 University Avenue and 3118 Harvey Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Russ Owens, Duke Dykstra and Bill Dunlop. Owens gave a brief history of the site and explained the needs for the carports as well as the creation of a fire access lane for the Shorewood House, as well as an increase in bicycle and moped parking/storage. A boundary screening cedar fence will be installed between the carports. The Secretary stated this was an existing development with a surface parking lot that didn’t conform to the older Zoning Code standards for landscaping and screening, as well as the current code requirements. Compliance with any change from the existing condition means you are expected to meet any applicable code requirements. Currently under the Zoning Code it is not required because it’s not a reconfiguration of the parking geometric arrangement, but in an Urban Design District this type of change, which is an improvement beyond what is already there, raises the issue that the project is required to adhere to an acceptable urban design standard. The fence issue needs to be dealt with because you cannot rely on someone else to properly screen your parking area.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- What type of pavement is that?
 - It’s all asphalt.
- What happens to all the stormwater?
 - The stormwater from the Harvey Street side is going underground (storage) because there is a change to the impervious area on the University property. There is an inlet at the back of the property that drains to the front.
- What if you were to take off stalls along the edges to add landscaping?
 - Because it’s bordering a residential property we’d still have to use some type of boundary screening.

I’m not so worried about the screening. I’m more worried about getting some shade and breaking that up (expanse of impervious surface). It’d be nice to get it interior.

- There's other landscaping that could be entertained.

The only reason there's no landscaping is because the stalls are being put from inch to inch. We really are pushing everybody else for landscaping in their parking lots. Shade trees.

- There currently isn't any landscaping on the site right now, but we are adding these small green areas with trees. In order to accommodate the number of cars that park here, that live and work in Shorewood House, we're trying to maximize what we can.
- This is kind of a unique situation, I wonder whether there are some pervious pavements that we might explore throughout. If we were to ask you to adhere to our normal standards for a parking lot you would lose a lot of parking, so I understand that would be difficult. This is an opportunity for you to think creatively in terms of pervious pavement.
- Certain areas could not use pervious pavement because of the vehicles, you'd have to check with Traffic Engineering for that.
- I don't see anywhere for the snow.
 - We have an area to the side that doesn't show anything, just 20-feet of space.
- Once again, because of the change you have to meet certain minimum requirements, including functional loading and unloading which is not part of the drive aisle.
- Did you look at designing a carport that actually had green roofs that would start to absorb some of the heat? It's probably cost-prohibitive. They're not pretty now, they're not going to get any prettier with use.
- Did I see potential for future solar panels on the roof? You may want to look at, rather than building a traditional structure and putting a solar panel tank on top, cost-wise you may want to look at the systems that they themselves (solar panels) structurally can act as a carport, rather than duplicating potential cost.
- Knowing that it's just a fire lane, but still as a pedestrian walking by you have a small piece of roof that's covering a/c units and bike parking, but it would provide for a view corridor direct to the building if you omitted that small area covering the bikes. We should have a view corridor as someone walking.
- If you have a full sized car that is backing out of a stall that has no space, think of a larger car. You may consider leasing those to compact cars because it has a better chance. It's fraught with issues that could be problematic. That'd be a great place for tree islands, on the ends.
- I'd like to refer this, come up with a landscape plan, and you need to deal with this backing up issue. I do think you need to look at the stormwater a little bit.
- Consider and maybe bring back an option where these have flat roofs, because of the different orientations, there's a lot of other things going on and the flat roof would give you the opportunity for some green roof trays. Maybe you can't afford all the spaces, but perhaps they could run along the structures closest to the building.

ACTION:

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by O'Kroley, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided for the following:

- Bring back a landscape plan that deals with the backing up issue.
- Reduction in the amount of impervious area in favor of more landscaping both interior and peripheral to the site.
- Look into increased stormwater management.
- Consider flat roofs for potential green roof trays.

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 3.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 3009 University Avenue & 3118 Harvey Street

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

- General Comments:
- Reconsider approach to incorporate sustainability practices.
 - Need more planting: trees.