

AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

| | |
|--|---|
| REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION | PRESENTED: February 3, 2010 |
| TITLE: 1723 Waldorf Boulevard – Modified PUD(SIP), Two Building, 80-Unit Residential Development. 1 st Ald. Dist. | REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK: |
| AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary | ADOPTED: POF: |
| DATED: February 3, 2010 | ID NUMBER: |

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn Weber, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, Ron Luskin, R. Richard Wagner and Jay Ferm.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 3, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of an amended PUD(SIP) located at 1723 Waldorf Boulevard.

Appearing on behalf of the project was Randy Bruce. Prior to the presentation, staff noted that the project as previously approved has received final approval in April of 2008. The version at that time featured two large buildings located at the site's frontage on Mayo Drive with a smaller building located at the northerly apex of the property featuring four attached townhouse units. Building No. 2 at the corner of Waldorf Boulevard and Mayo Drive had provisions to support a limited extent of commercial development on the first floor with a range of 38 to 43 units in total within the building with Building No. 3 fronting on Mayo Drive supporting 32 units. As an introduction to the project as currently modified, Bruce noted that changes to the market provide for the elimination of the northerly 4-unit building in combination with the development of the remaining two buildings as rental units rather than their previous condominium designation. The modified site plan still features the two large buildings in their relative previous location down-sized and reconfigured with an interconnected lower level parking structure beneath along with surface parking. Review of the building elevations noted that the previous design in favor of flat roofs with extended parapets have been replaced with a building's featuring hipped roofs. The unit count of the buildings feature a range of efficiency, 1-bedroom, 1-bedroom with den, and 2-bedroom units with 48 units proposed for the large building off of the corner of Mayo Drive and Waldorf Boulevard and 32 units within the building fronting Mayo Drive. Outside of the change in roof type, the building materials and colors would be generally consistent with that as previously approved according to Bruce.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- The issue with the change in roof configuration. Bruce noted that it was based on economics where the utilization of a roof with membrane versus shingles was less where the applicant had also considered a change from the use of cement board to vinyl would also be helpful.
- On the grading plan look at the relocating the lower level main garage door entry to the north elevation of Building No. 2 off of the 45 stall surface parking lot; to eliminate the drive at Mayo Drive.
- Look at a gabled roof form instead of hip roof form with shingles. OK.

- Massage site plan in coordination with the existing street plantings using large trees to fill in voids.
- Provide pedestrian connection on left side of the driveway entry of the 12-stall surface parking lot off of Mayo Drive to Building No. 1 and look at reconfiguring the footprint of Building No. 1 to better relate to the apex of the corner as with the previous version approved in April of 2008.
- Question the depth of soil within the crab planter, suggest using an arbor with vines or an alternative, 24-inch soil depth not sufficient to support.
- Swap out ornamental trees for large shade trees off of Mayo Drive.
- A feature treatment of one bay not sufficient to tie the building to the corner. Consider splay-out easterly projection to relate and orient building to the east.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-1) with Luskin voting no. The motion to refer the requirements addressed above stated concerns and the following:

- Re-examine the site plan to address the above stated concerns and provide entries for Building No. 1 that relate to its location at a corner as well as its street frontages to provide examine an alternative entry for the parking garage such as the northerly face of Building No. 2.
- Revisit the architecture of the building using a pitched/gabled roof form but replace crab trees within planters using vining with an arbor.
- Identify existing street trees within the adjacent public right-of-ways with the incorporation of large shade trees on Mayo Drive as a response to the location of street trees.
- Provide site context information as well as a detailed review of the current proposed plan against the previously approved project on this site.
- Look at placement of bike parking stalls be moved in closer to entries.
- Look at creating pedestrian connectivity between Mayo Drive and the central courtyard feature.

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 6, 6, 5, 5.5, 6, 5 and 4.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1723 Waldorf Boulevard

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Member Ratings | | | | | | | | 6 |
| | 6 | 6 | 5 | | | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| | 5 | 5 | 5 | | | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | 5.5 |
| | 6 | 6 | 6 | | | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| | 5 | | | | | | | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | referred |
| | | | | | | | | 4 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Prefer previous architecture and site plan.
- What about entry to parking garage thru building 2 at Northface?
- Much prefer flat roof. This is just another suburban big house -- blah...
- Understand that economics are driving changes – but prefer earlier design.