

## AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 6, 2013
TITLE: 6733 Fairhaven Road – PUD(GDP-SIP), 51 New Apartment Units. 7 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (25968)	REFERRED:  REREFERRED:  REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: March 6, 2013	ID NUMBER:

---

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Melissa Huggins, Henry Lufner, Tom DeChant, Richard Slayton, Dawn O’Kroley and Marsha Rummel.

### SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 6, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 6733 Fairhaven Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Josh Johnson and Kevin Kavanaugh, representing Fairhaven Court, LLC. Johnson presented revised plans for the apartment project. The project includes underground parking, with surface parking on the backside. The break-up of the roof elements shortens the façade which also changes the view as you come up the street. In addressing staff’s previous comments wrapping will continue around the building, which also cleans up the front door area. The gable is now centered to the window on the front elevation. A design element has been created for the gable. Material samples were shown. Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- What about cement board siding instead of vinyl?
  - The upkeep on cement board is expensive.
- Consider at least cement corner boards, window trim, and roof rakes or a synthetic alternative beyond vinyl and line-up windows with gable.
- If you can get a foot change in plane on some of the areas where the brick goes up two stories, if you can get that to project by a foot and have a secondary gable that might break it down a little bit more to relate some of the smaller houses within the area.
- I have a concern about the sides (end elevations), both the big sides and smaller projecting sides where they’re unrelieved. To me additional windows would put more light in those units.
  - I agree with you on that. I want to put windows in there. I would expect staff to see that as a final design element before approval.
- To the west of the drive aisle, you have a straight line which is very formal but it’s not strong enough as a juxtaposition to that space. I’d make it part of the other plantings, taking the one that’s closest to the street, moving it to the left and then down a bit. But make sure it’s a different spacing than the two (trees).
- When you hide the dumpster by putting arborvitae around it you’ve taken a small monster and made it a much bigger monster; don’t make it linear or just use the screen around dumpster.

- If you could beef up by about 15-20% the plantings around the building; it doesn't have to hold the building so tightly, it can breathe a little bit, not belt tight.
- A 3-window wide gable coming at you is substantially larger scale than any house on the block, so that can somehow get broken down. Just something to break down the scale of it. Adjust roof gables face on the ends of the long elevations to come straight across with the middle two to be either shed roofs or double gable within a gable.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by O'Krolely, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion required address of the above stated comments and the following:

- Modify elevations with shed roof, or double gable element as described.
- Gazebo structure in back for grills is allowed with details to be approved by staff.
- Hardi-board corner boards, window trim, roof rakes, or synthetic alternatives.

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 5 and 5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 6733 Fairhaven Road**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-
	5	5	5	-	-	-	5	5

**General Comments:**

- Improved design.
- Too typical suburban, not distinguished.
- Enhance plantings (15-20%) at roadside building façade. Groupings vs. linear arrangements.