

AGENDA # 9

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: December 20, 2006
TITLE: 6026 Canyon Parkway – Planned Residential Development (PRD)/25-Units. 16 th Ald. Dist. (04824)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: William A. Fruhling, Acting Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: December 20, 2006	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Lou Host-Jablonski, Lisa Geer, Todd Barnett and Ald. Noel Radomski.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of December 20, 2006, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a 25-unit Planned Residential Development located at 6026 Canyon Parkway. Appearing on behalf of the project was Bob Bouril. He explained the context and initial proposal, and asked for some feedback on whether utilizing only one-story buildings would be acceptable.

Barnett encouraged utilizing some two-story units. Most of the discussion focused on concerns about the site design – especially the large, inefficient layout of the center of the site.

The Commission suggested looking at creating two separate drive courts that are not interconnected to get a larger greenspace in the center of the property. It was suggested that fewer parking stalls or a more efficient parking arrangement should be looked at. It was also noted that the approaches to individual garages are not deep enough to park a car in.

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 ratings for this project are 3 and 3.

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	3	-	-	-	-	-	4	3
	3	4	-	-	-	3	3	3

General Comments:

- Prefer the multi-level mix to just the single level. Look at new site layout to reduce paving and maximize usable open space.
- Look at alternative site concepts.
- Site concept really needs re-working. It would be a shame to lose the opportunity for wheelchair accessible homes because of a misplaced bias against slab-on-grade foundations.
- Much more greenspace is needed. Look forward to new concept and site plan.