

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: July 21, 2010

TITLE: 700 Block Segoe Road – PUD(SIP) for
Two 4-Story Apartment Buildings. 11th
Ald. Dist. (18649)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 21, 2010

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Todd Barnett, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, Jay Ferm and Henry Lufler.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 21, 2010, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(SIP) located in the 700 Block of Segoe Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were J. Randy Bruce, representing Stone House Development; and Ald. Chris Schmidt, representing the 11th District. Registered neither in support nor opposition was Helda Goodman. Bruce presented a revised site and building plans. He noted a retaining wall feature between this site and the Target site addressing concerns regarding screening with the planting area with the increase by narrowing the building and pulling parking back. A trellis system will create an architectural feature in this area. The center terraced courtyard will have usable gathering space and is well landscaped. Entry at the corner of the building has been incorporated with a sidewalk towards Segoe and Frye. There are also individual entries and common entries in other areas of the building. While the two buildings are a pair, they will vary slightly in building materials and architectural features for some individuality. Proposed signage was noted including discussions with Target about the possibility of maintaining the previously approved concept of shared signage. Staff noted the conditions established with the “Target” approval, relative to directional ground signage on this site where “subject to review and change as part of the approval of any future development on that portion of the site” (this parcel). Comments from the Commission were as follows:

- The windows at the top of the taller turret features are an opportunity to open up the mullions and give the element a sense of top. Maybe deleting the additional horizontal mullion would do the trick.
- I think it’s a wonderful project and I’m glad you brought the materials. It’s going to be a very nice project there.
- Appreciate putting entry at corner.
- Like where you’ve gone with the architecture, I like the variety and distinguishing between the buildings. Massing and rhythm works very nicely.
- The steel structure will stand alone in that material. Could you introduce steel as a column at the entries to pull that through?
- Would like to see the elevations of the bioretention areas.
- Not sure you’ve got the right species and will get enough sun.
- Review what is being planted in the Hilldale area; you may want to think about something different.

- I like the dark colors at the top.
- I really like the direction you're taking this.
- Look at putting a 12 stall bike ramp at the north end stair.
- Increase your bike racks at the main entrance to eight.
- Study more bike parking at the upper level.
- Look at moped parking. If this is affordable housing, mopeds could be an issue.

ACTION:

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** subject to address of the above. The motion was passed on a unanimous vote of (7-0).

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 6, 6, 6, 7, 7 and 8.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 700 Block Segoe Road

| | Site Plan | Architecture | Landscape Plan | Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc. | Signs | Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular) | Urban Context | Overall Rating |
|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Member Ratings | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | - | 7 | 8 | 7 |
| | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6 |
| | 6 | 6 | 6 | - | - | 6 | 7 | 7 |
| | 7 | 7 | - | - | - | 7 | 7 | 8 |
| | 7 | 6 | 5 | - | - | 6 | 7 | 6 |
| | - | 6 | - | - | - | - | 6 | 6 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

General Comments:

- Look at trellis structure at east property line.
- Well executed housing design – good urban design.
- Very fine infill project.
- Adequacy of bioretention area? Appropriate mix? Refine entry landscape. Nice project!
- Study French patio doors to allow the patio space to become an extension of the room in lieu of a separate small, often not used space. Comfortable scale and massing.