

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 22, 2006
TITLE: 3423 Sugar Maple Lane – PUD. 1 st Ald. Dist.	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: March 22, 2006	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Lisa Geer, Lou Host-Jablonski, Cathleen Feland, Jack Williams, Robert March, Todd Barnett and Ald. Noel Radomski.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 22, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** on a PUD located at 3423 Sugar Maple Lane. Appearing on behalf of the project were Thomas and Margaret Sansone. Prior to the presentation on this item, staff noted to the Commission that the subject property was in the preliminary stages of annexation where consideration by the Commission was unusual due to the property not being currently within the City’s jurisdiction. The scheduling of this item was intended to give the applicant a “heads-up” relevant to the proposed development of the property under a potential PUD zoning designation; where the Commission would provide feedback on the preliminary level of plans as currently proposed. Attorney Tom Sansone provided an overview of the project elaborating on its proximity to condominium development within the “Hawk’s Landing” subdivision to the south. The development proposal provides for the creation of 10 townhouse style attached condominium homes featuring lower level attached garages, access off a single driveway along the property’s southerly perimeter with the condominium development perpendicular to Sugar Maple Lane. Based on this orientation, the dominant feature of the south elevation would be ten double wide garage doors with the bulk of the living space of the attached townhouses oriented toward the north side of the lot. The applicant felt that this orientation was necessary in order to deal with ice and snow issues that will be compounded if located on the north elevation. Following the presentation, the Commission expressed concerns on the following:

- Concerns were expressed with the view of a row of 10 double wide garage doors for each of the units from the adjoining condominium properties to the south.
- Concerns were expressed that every room that would get natural light was located on the north elevation, which provides for a limitation on the availability of natural light, with the car side of the building enjoying the south side exposure.
- Reexamine proposed piping of stormwater off-site on the site plan with considerations given toward its correlation with the landscape plan and how drainage works in combination with an on-site system function.
- Examine how landscaping is to be developed to create usable outdoor space for the proposed units.
- Concern with building orientation not being friendly with adjacent development, as well as the proposed driveway location on the south side of the lot.

- Orientation of garages are all the same. Need to provide for differences in articulation and orientation for each unit.
- Need more contextual information on the site and adjoining properties to include photos.
- Figure out a way to soften impact of the double-wide garage doors for each unit along the south or north elevations if considered.
- The distance between the driveway and the front of the attached homes is adequate to provide for the relocation of the driveway to the north side and eliminate concerns with snow removal; consider orienting living space facing south to take advantage of solar gain and create a more amiable relationship to adjoining neighbors to the south, in addition to considering angling or staggering the attached units.
- Examine the opportunity to turn garages to face east and west.
- Look at elevations to take advantage of grade to create underground garages and provide more open space along the south elevation, as well as reorientation of the attached units.

ACTION:

Since this was an **INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION**, no 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 ratings for this project are 3, 4, 5, 5, 5, 5.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 3423 Sugar Maple Lane

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	3	4	-	-	-	4	3	3
	5	-	-	-	-	-	5	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	5
	5	6	-	-	-	6	6	5.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5

General Comments:

- Need more imaginative site plan – tightly spaced parallel units not good. Row of garage doors facing neighbors is bad. Need photos of existing homes.
- Consider orienting the living areas to the south to provide longer sunlight opportunities. Ice on the drive can be aided by correct drainage. Screen drive parking area. Like the covered stoop entrance and nice size deck areas as designed.
- Cookie cutter building design (with mediocre interior layouts, by the way). Site use conception needs rethinking, to avoid a street full of garage doors.
- Needs additional development to resolve site design.
- Those 15’ garage doors really dominate the elevation.
- Look at alternative parking schemes.