

AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: May 23, 2007
TITLE: 6026 Canyon Parkway – Planned Residential Development (PRD)/25-Units. 16 th Ald. Dist. (04824)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: May 23, 2007	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Marsha Rummel, Lou Host-Jablonski, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Michael Barrett and Richard Slayton.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of May 23, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PRD located at 6026 Canyon Parkway. Appearing on behalf of the project were Robert Bouril and David Milburn. The modified plans as presented featured the following:

- The central courtyard has been opened up and expanded in size.
- The 3-unit has been placed at the apex of the center of the courtyard as a terminal focus, including the addition of pedestrian linkages from outlying buildings.
- The addition of pedestrian pathway utilizing differential pavement along the perimeter of the main access drive, along with connection link to the public park, including seat areas along with the softening of the radii of the main access drive. The buildings will be permanently vinyl sided utilizing a variable color palette in ten different schemes, but brick now limited only on front porch columns.
- Although vinyl siding is proposed, hardiboard will be an optional material as reflected within the packet and renderings.

Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- There appears to be less shade trees on the west side of the development as presented and contained within the packet and handout materials. In addition, landscaping around buildings is not identified. The reconfiguration and design of the central courtyard appears to have provided for reduction in shade trees; provide as previously proposed.
- Shade trees at central courtyard at center should be modified to provide for a minimum of four trees at frame.
- Trees along westerly lot line were to undulate, not line up. Modify.
- Move bioretention at center courtyard to the east between Buildings 4 and 2, provide green lawn at center courtyard.
- It is bothersome that some porches come out directly into the access drive (hard surface) as noted on the renderings; need to provide a transition.

- Consider short wall on porches for additional screening adjacent to the access drive, in addition to landscape between walk and buildings.
- Relative to architecture, for instance on Building 3, look at details such as how the porch stoop meets the corner board.
- Appreciate that the vinyl siding as proposed matches that on adjacent single-family homes; but hardiplank is preferred. Consider trading out metal roof for hardiplank. If vinyl siding is approved, look at corner boards of other materials such as miratech.
- Issue with roof water directed across hard surface; consider alternatives. Issue with freezing on surface.
- Plans only show one wheelchair accessible unit. Existing grades easterly portions should be utilized to accommodate more accessible units.
- Issue with siding slamming into the ground; not seen in renderings correctly, modify.
- Add an accessible unit or two in buildings around central courtyard.

ACTION:

On a motion by Woods, seconded by Barnett, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-1) with Host-Jablonski voting no. The motion required address of the above stated concerns with final consideration of the project.

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, 6 and 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 6026 Canyon Parkway

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	5	6	6	-	-	6	5	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.5
	5	5	4/5	5	-	6	-	5
	5	5	5	-	-	5	5	5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
	6	7	6	6	-	6	5	6

General Comments:

- Architectural details need more work entrances from driveway need landscaping and separation from vehicles.
- Site concept places front doors directly on the drive aisle, with no buffer or separation.
- Integrate street and commons better avoid linear placement of trees at west.
- Soften and or improve the front door exit into the street. Shade west side of building with large shade trees. Improve open green space.
- Stormwater issues need to be resolved.
- Well-organized spaces and amenities. Very creative green courtyard.
- Study entry porches (particularly at parking), accessible unit locations, no vinyl, two colors of shingle (and no metal roofing).