# City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PRESENTED: July 29, 2015

TITLE: 550 Junction Road – PD(GDP-SIP), **REFERRED:** 

Mixed-Use Community Consisting of
Three Buildings with Commercial and
Residential Uses. 9<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (39396)

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary ADOPTED: POF:

DATED: July 29, 2015 ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Lois Braun-Oddo, Richard Slayton, Tom DeChant, Dawn O'Kroley, John Harrington, Sheri Carter and Michael Rosenblum.

\*Due to technical issues with the recording of this meeting for the record, specific details on this discussion are not available.\*

## **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of July 29, 2015, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a PD(GDP-SIP) located at 550 Junction Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce and Janine Glaeser, representing LZ Ventures. They are proposing a mixed-use development for commercial uses across the front edge of the building on Junction Road with residential uses in the back.

• Provide more context of the site in conjunction with adjacent development. Staff noted issues with the arrangement of parking on the northerly lot line requiring a landscaped setback, excess of surface parking on the site, the need for alternative linkages from the site to surrounding adjacent development and open space, the sufficiency of a buffer with adjacent single-family development and consideration for additional residential densities along Junction Road. Staff also noted that the proposal was a departure from the commercial office development anticipated within the adopted neighborhood plan and general commercial in the PD-GDP on this property.

#### **ACTION**:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** no formal action was taken by the Commission.

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 rating for this project is 4.

# URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 550 Junction Road

|                | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape<br>Plan | Site<br>Amenities,<br>Lighting,<br>Etc. | Signs | Circulation<br>(Pedestrian,<br>Vehicular) | Urban<br>Context | Overall<br>Rating |
|----------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------|---|-------|---|------------------|-------------------|
|                | 4         | 5            | -                 | -                                       | -     | 4   | 4                | 4                 |
|                | 4         | -            | 5                 | -                                       | -     | -   | -                | -                 |
|                |           |              |                   |   |       |   |                  |                   |
| S              |           |              |                   |   |       |   |                  |                   |
| Member Ratings |           |              |                   |   |       |   |                  |                   |
|                |           |              |                   |   |       |   |                  |                   |
| Me             |           |              |                   |   |       |   |                  |                   |
|                |           |              |                   |   |       |   |                  |                   |
|                |           |              |                   |   |       |   |                  |                   |
|                |           |              |                   |   |       |   |                  |                   |

## General Comments:

- Parking is extremely inefficient.
- Poor site plan.