

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: July 15, 2009

TITLE: 8101 and 8119 Mid-Town Road – PUD-SIP, Eighty-Eight Unit Residential Development. 1st Ald. Dist. (05832)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 15, 2009

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 15, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-SIP located at 8101 and 8119 Mid-Town Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce and Rich Arnesen, both representing Stone House Development. Bruce's presentation of the revised plans emphasized the following:

- Adjustments to the building elevations to reduce the amount of vertical piers in favor of an emphasis on vertical balcony elements utilizing the same stone as previously proposed, in addition to adjustments and variation in window placement and size.
- Modifications to the individual building entry treatments to be individually unique.

Following the presentation of the building materials and colors palette, the Commission noted the following:

- Relative to bike parking issues. Long-term bike parking should be provided at a one-to-one ratio indoors utilizing wall hooks beyond the threshold required minimally by code. Bruce noted that a suggested alternative to cut back on exterior bike parking in favor of providing more interior bike parking stalls and additional landscaping amenities could be addressed with maintenance of the proposed stalls on the exterior of the building with provision of additional stalls utilizing hooks is acceptable.

ACTION:

On a motion by Harrington, seconded by Luskin, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (8-0). The motion included the adjustments to interior and exterior bike parking.

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, 6, 6.5, 7, 7 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 8101 and 8119 Mid-Town Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	7	8	7	-	-	7	7	7
	8	8	8	8	-	7	7	8
	6.5	6.5	6	-	-	6.5	-	6.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	6	6	6	-	-	6	6	6
	6	7	-	6	-	6	6	7

General Comments:

- Nicely resolved elevations!

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: June 17, 2009

TITLE: 8101 and 8119 Mid-Town Road – PUD-SIP, Eighty-Eight Unit Residential Development. 1st Ald. Dist. (05832)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: June 17, 2009

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 17, 2009, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-SIP located at 8101 and 8119 Mid-Town Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Richard Arnesen and J. Randy Bruce, both representing Stone House Development; Dave Glusick and Ken Saiki. Prior to the presentation staff noted that the project provides for development of two residential lots located within a 79 acre development bounded on the south by Mid-Town Road, on the east and west by Waldorf Boulevard and Carns Drive, and Mayo Drive to the north. The General Development Plan provided for 7 developable lots and an outlot for detention purposes, where northerly portions of the project were intended to be developed for residential uses with southerly portions of the project dedicated for commercial use. The PUD-SIP under consideration provides for development of two of the northerly lots for a 42-unit and a 46-unit residential project featuring four-stories with lower level parking. Bruce provided an overview of the project area against the previously approved GDP, including a review of the various building elevations, with Glusick detailing the overall stormwater drainage plan, and Saiki providing an overview of the landscape plan. Bruce emphasized a tightening up of surface parking between buildings from a double-loaded arrangement to a single-loaded bay as a departure from the PUD-GDP. The plans provide for a 4-story building which steps down to 3-stories. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- Like density and squeezing of surface parking but design needs more architecture rather than beyond a proportional grid.
- Needs more variation in elevations, needs more variation in window placement and size, needs to look at duality between horizontal and vertical elements.
- Need to treat entry treatments different.

ACTION:

On a motion by Wagner, seconded by Ferm, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-0-1) with Slayton abstaining. The motion cited address of the above stated concerns, with an emphasis that the building design needs to be more interesting.

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, 6.5, 7 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 8101 and 8119 Mid-Town Road

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	7	7	-	8	-	7	8	7
	6	6	-	-	-	6	6	6
	6.5	6	6	-	-	6	7	6.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7

General Comments:

- Architecture seems a bit unfinished – too bland/simple.