

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: February 20, 2013

TITLE: 6801 Littlemore Drive – PUD-SIP for a Two-Building, Sixty-One Unit Residential Development. 3rd Ald. Dist. (28829)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: February 20, 2013

ID NUMBER:

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 20, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-SIP located at 6801 Littlemore Drive. Appearing on behalf of the project were J. Randy Bruce and Ald. Lauren Cnare, District 3. The site has a small wetland feature in the center that may be removed from wetland status. Individual entry porches are proposed for the apartments as well as a main entrance into the buildings. Material choices include buff colored brick, horizontal vinyl siding in two body colors with a trim color, and asphalt shingle. There has been some discussion about single-family houses being built in this area but no more multi-family.

Ald. Lauren Cnare, District 3 mentioned a neighborhood meeting regarding this project and people liked the building in general. They did not have concerns with the look or location of the development. She mentioned that the street is more narrow than others and influenced the front entry locations and street parking availability.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Don’t like roof form or vinyl siding.
- You’ve got parking right up against peoples’ houses; this is a great greenspace you could utilize, you could take out 9 stalls or so and make that truly a greenspace without butting up against someone’s house.
 - This is our fire access lane and we’ve got to have a turn around. You could create a turn around that doesn’t necessarily look like a turn around. Look at access to Littlemore Drive and limit use for fire access to allow redesign to eliminate nine stall parking area.
- I need to see a planting plan that I can actually read and identify what the materials are. Planting plan not readable, plants not labeled. Next time bring 11” x 17”.
- Incorporate wetlands into landscape plan.
- Consider access off of Wayalusing Drive as an alternative where the southerly access off of East Hill Parkway becomes fire access.

- Maybe these buildings could have some distinctiveness among themselves. Have you looked at other colors?
- If the two buildings are going to look alike maybe just vary the color palette.
- Could the roof forms have some sort of association with entry so it feels more like rowhouses?
- Why not have people feel like they have a bit more identity to their own entries?
- I have to challenge if the buildings have to be identical in their color and detailing. I understand not wanting flat roofs but I don't know that we need one continuous lid on them. Maybe there's an opportunity for a portion of the building middle to have a lower roof or a flat roof portion and then it starts to read like the rowhouses we talked about. There may be an opportunity for a gabled end, something to differentiate them. As an option the two-story building roof as designed remains with the three-story building featuring a different roof expression.

ACTION:

On a motion by Lufler, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (7-2) with Huggins and Rummel voting no. The motion required address of the landscape plan, access/fire access and building differentiation, color/material palette and roof forms.

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, 5, 5 and 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 6801 Littlemore Drive

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	5	-	-	-	4	5	5
	5	5	5	-	-	6	7	5
	-	5	-	-	-	4	-	5
	5	6	6	-	-	5	5	5

General Comments:

- Rework 33-Unit building.
- Work on parking lot and improving beauty of buildings.
- Rethink drive and parking to create more general green space.