

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** August 8, 2012

TITLE: 1108 Moorland Road – Planned Residential Development (PRD). 14th Ald. Dist. (26966) **REFERRED:**

REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:

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

DATED: August 8, 2012 **ID NUMBER:**

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

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of August 8, 2012, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PRD located at 1108 Moorland Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were Jonathan Brinkley, the project architect; and Aaron Williams. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Kevin Newell, Kevin Mantz, Jim Borris, Mike Mervis and Kim Ford. Brinkley gave the site context and current conditions, including distressed cantilevered balconies, a tennis court and swimming pool which are no longer functional and open dumpster areas. Plans call for a new clubhouse with a leasing office/center, community room, sitting area and warming kitchen for residents. Fiberglass shingles brick will be used to match the existing apartment buildings, along with fiber cement lap siding, aluminum fascia and soffits. Amenities will include a soccer field, community gardens available for residents and a playground and half court basketball area. Additional single-stall garage buildings are planned for a total of one stall per two dwelling units. The new mix will have 254 units and a total of 500 total spaces, 373 are surface and 127 are garages. Bicycle parking is also being added, as well as five dumpster enclosures and 5% accessible units including one building with an elevator. Williams presented the landscape plan for safety, delineation and aesthetics. Point requirements are in effect for the parking lot and are well exceeded with existing vegetation. A neighborhood meeting is scheduled and they have had discussions with the area’s Alder, Tim Bruer. Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- You’ve got some unique amenities you can tap into, I suggest you mention those as well at the Plan Commission.
- I struggle that you’re limited with all of this parking. When I look at the center it’s unfortunate that it’s this hodge-podge of parking. Your landscaping plan is going to go a long way, but a lot of your renderings we see the backs of the buildings; if you’re in the center you’re going to be looking at the backs of the garages. How will you treat them?
 - From a building perspective there are no windows. From a landscape perspective, there is no vegetation shown, which is a safety issue. Matching existing conditions is another reason. From a resident standpoint, not having those planted is a double-edged sword.

- The site has quite a bit of relief and the site is built into the hills somewhat. There is quite a bit of height difference.

I'm thinking about the experience of people living here and looking over here. I wish we could flip some of this and tuck the garages around rather than have them in the center. I would like to see some sort of treatment for those buildings because they are so central and will have an effect on the overall ambience.

- There is a need for aesthetics no matter who is living here. I think it could be boosted up a bit.
- All the fronts of all of these buildings are pretty identical. Can we give them some diversity, in the landscape? Try to get some uniqueness.

- I think it reads better as a similar aesthetic throughout.

But you can mix them up differently so not everything is identical. I think you can find a balance there.

- We really do want to see breaks in your parking lot. After every 12 stalls we want to see an island. This was mentioned in the pre-application meeting as an urban design standard.
- The lushness versus the stark grass; I'd love to see some groupings of trees that start to create lines in here rather than just straight, straight, straight.
- Architecturally I would study further making balconies different from one building to another, so you make a neighborhood of things that are similar but can play off each other a little bit.

○ We do recognize the need for individuality in the buildings. We have 3 different color schemes. I think we're looking for something more than color schemes.

How you detail the railings. Maybe one building differs from the other slightly stylistically in how the railing is re-applied. If there are 7 buildings, maybe 3 of them are similar and 4 of them are similar, you don't need to over-articulate them but you have an opportunity to solve the problem in two different ways in terms of re-facing portions of the building.

- See if you can somehow strengthen your connection to the clubhouse. If all the garages are nearly touching you've just created a playground. The walls of them are creating spaces within.
- I suggest you consider some gable ends at the clubhouse. The other buildings are dominated by gable ends but the clubhouse is hip roof.
- All these garages just walls in this internal space.
 - There's so much grade happening in both directions that most of the garages have to step relative to each other.

ACTION:

On a motion by Huggins, seconded by Lufler, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion required address of landscape comments, differentiation of individual buildings beyond the color scheme as noted with architecture modified as recommended. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0).

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 4, 5, 5, 5, 5 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1108 Moorland Road

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

General Comments:

- Could be at least a 6 with suggestions by UDC.
- Appreciate refreshment. Not convinced that 50% garages needed. More tree islands in parking lot.
- Clubhouse hip roof inconsistent with gable and dormer roof forms of existing buildings. Backs of garages not shown or considered.