

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: October 23, 2013

TITLE: 5817 Halley Way at Grandview Commons - PUD-SIP, for 61 Condominiums in Two Buildings. 3rd Ald. Dist. (07173)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: October 23, 2013

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Slayton, Acting Chair; Dawn O’Kroley, Melissa Huggins, Lauren Chare, Cliff Goodhart, John Harrington and Tom DeChant.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of October 23, 2013, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD-SIP located at 5817 Halley Way for 61 condominiums in two buildings. Appearing on behalf of the project were Meg Roback, Brian Keegan, Josh Johnson and Shawn McKibben. Roback presented plans for an 82-unit apartment/condominium complex for 55+ adults in the Grandview Commons neighborhood. This was previously approved and recorded in 2007 but was never built. The building is proposed at 3-stories with underground parking. Two primary entries are proposed, one for the condominiums and one for the apartments; this also strengthens the pedestrian connections through the site. The footprint and materials (composite, lap siding and brick veneer) are all the same from the 2007 approval, with an increase in the number of units from 61 to 82.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- Some articulation may help with breaking up the large stone masses at the base from a pedestrian perspective; there’s still a lot of base against the pedestrian level. The corner sign element is reinforcing this wall against the street.
  - We have quite a bit of foundation plantings to soften that stone. That’s going to lessen the harshness you see in the computer generated elevation view.

Is there anything else you can do to articulate the stone?

Beyond foundation plantings and landscaping perhaps we could look at benches or something to activate that a little bit further.

- What’s preventing you from putting some openings in the wall?
  - That is secured underground parking at this point. We want a temperate parking garage for the comfort of the residents, that’s a really important amenity.

I think a few windows wouldn’t compromise the thermal environment, I just think some daylighting the parking garage wouldn’t hurt either. Not everywhere certainly but it would help to articulate that base a little bit if some openings in the wall were related to the openings in the building above.

- I encourage you to think of something because it just looks like a giant foundation. It's a nice building but I don't think it's showing its best face to my face as I walk down that road there. Plants would probably make the most sense but you might need something more four seasonal.
- I wonder if something on the upper parts of the building could help break that up. There are corners of the building that just aren't expressed.
- I'm a little concerned about the proportions of the windows, they look like horizontal sliders. Are they just slightly off of being center?
  - Yes they're off center, but not sliders.It doesn't seem to differentiate the mass, they're just sort of randomly different in the way it's slightly off center and relates to the garage. Looking at these elements as unified compositions might help a little bit.
- I am concerned about the articulation of the massing.
- Wary of line of plantings on long elevations; the landscaping line needs to relate to the architecture. There's too much stone mulch; use shredded mulch with steel edging.

**ACTION:**

On a motion by Slayton, seconded by DeChant, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided for address of the landscape issues as they relate to architecture and base issues, and issue with articulation of the building's mass.

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, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 5817 Halley Way

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

General Comments:

- Base needs more relief, rethink the wobbly line of landscaping around the building.
- Pretty pedestrian design – could have been more creative. Good to move entrances to corners.
- Signage walls at entries act as visual barriers. Punch some openings in base wall.