

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** July 23, 2014

TITLE: 1936 (formerly 1902) Tennyson Lane –
Amended PD(GDP-SIP), Northside Prairie
Senior Living Community. 12th Ald. Dist.
(31335) **REFERRED:**
REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: July 23, 2014

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Tom DeChant, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Melissa Huggins and Dawn O’Kroley.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of July 23, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of an Amended PD(GDP-SIP) for Northside Prairie Senior Living Community located at 1936 Tennyson Lane. Appearing on behalf of the project were Bill Robison and Rita Giovannoni, both representing Independent Living, Inc.; and Ken Saiki, representing Ken Saiki Design. Robison described changes to the plans which include simplification of the patterning of the windows, and the materiality on the side of the building has been reduced. They have also added a little additional articulation to the aluminum box projections into smaller vertical bays. The materials are still proposed to be cementitious panel on the bulk of the building with the lower portion changed to larger scale brick. Saiki addressed the issue of addressing the street; they have extended the promenade all the way to the orchard space, ending in ceremonial stair linking to the public sidewalk. Two accessible routes are available to the plaza level and also to the lower level. The orchard has been extended further and different trees have been added to extend the bloom period, as well as provide the residents with fruit. The basin location has been brought up and now contains a series of terraced levels and plantings that will soften that vertical exposure and make a greater connection. They studied changes to the mechanical systems and are looking at magic paks for the independent side where they can be hidden in the recesses of the balconies. The louvers would all be on surfaces that do not face the street and will be painted to match the exterior.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- What is the height of the wall as it terraces up?
 - I think you’re seeing the parapet on the wall which would actually be a railing. We have about a 10-foot space between the space above and the walkway. Plantings are intended to cover the wall.
- I think that inner parking loop area seems like an opportunity; if you could play with the way you’re doing your handicapped parking (add a median) you could get another tree in there, give it a more lush feeling and more plantings.

- We can look at it but I have a feeling it's pretty wall-to-wall right now because of the way the stalls are off-set.
- Have you looked at a square treatment instead of an arched path? It would change how the area is treated too. I just see a stronger form if it's a grid.
 - I think if you're on the ground you're not going to see that as strongly.

ACTION:

On a motion by Goodhart, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided that the applicant consider extending the orchard beyond the drive.

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 5 and 7.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1936 Tennyson Lane

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

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION

PRESENTED: June 25, 2014

TITLE: 1902 Tennyson Lane – Amended
PD(GDP-SIP), Northside Prairie Senior
Living Community. 12th Ald. Dist. (31335)

REFERRED:

REREFERRED:

REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary

ADOPTED:

POF:

DATED: June 25, 2014

ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Richard Wagner, Chair; Cliff Goodhart, Lauren Cnare, Tom DeChant, Melissa Huggins and Richard Slayton.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of June 25, 2014, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of an Amended PD(GDP-SIP) located at 1902 Tennyson Lane. Appearing on behalf of the project were Rita Giovannoni, Jim Shaver, representing Independent Living, Inc.; Gene Wells, representing Engberg Anderson Architects; Ken Saiki, representing Ken Saiki Design; Pat Saiki and Dan Kabara. The project has evolved from two 2-story wings to one 1-story wing; the wellness center has been moved underneath the assisted living building, the offices, mechanicals and kitchen area have also been moved. They have reduced the parking by about 20 stalls. The far side of the building will still have windows but become a public space. Both main base sections of the building will be cast stone, then brick material through the first floor, the vertical bands between the windows and at the end will be painted metal to look like slightly weathered zinc, and fiber cement occurs above the brick on both portions of the building in two separate colors to provide some variety and differentiation between the two sections of the building. Between the panels would be extruded anodized aluminum channel applied to the face of the building with the panels set into it, providing a grip at the edge of the panels so you don't see the edges, giving it a more finished appearance. The site is stepping down in tiers towards the orchard area, then down another 5-feet for a detention area, which exposes more of the base of the building with retaining walls to support the grades.

The Secretary noted that at the GDP review, the level of street engagement was emphasized in relationship to the site plan where almost no street engagement is showing now with the SIP proposal; it's more separated from the street. There was also discussion that the orchard would be a way to engage people from the street but now it's behind a wall. The applicant agreed with the idea of engaging the public, but noted the need to remember that this needs to be relatively flat because many of the people who will live here are likely to be using walkers and wheelchairs. The intent is to have a wall that provides a flat area for the orchard, it's not meant to be a barrier to block the sidewalk from the entry.

Kevin Firchow, Planning Division mentioned that there are two areas for the Urban Design Commission to look at in regards to the "Assisted Living" portion of the building: the end caps and the relationship of it coming out of the ground, needs some way to have an active use in this corner of the building. The overall composition is also of concern with one portion of the building more successful than another. Ideally this could be a nicer concept if it was one base material (masonry) with projecting metal boxes coming out. Cost constraints make this impossible. The northeast elevation proportions show three materials; some simplification of that would be desirable. It's a long façade without much area for breaks in material so it is difficult to change materials that way, we understand it is a challenge.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- If you move the activity area over to where you have all those walls and tried to activate that area, maybe the orchard could be a more natural flow.
 - Ken Saiki noted that they will work very hard to get that space as close to the street as possible. We will keep trying to push this edge further, but the more we mess around the less detention area they have.
- Maybe the wall could be brought back into the orchard area so that there is an area at the street that invites pedestrians. There's not a lot of room for placemaking here but that may be an opportunity.
- I want to see what your landscape architect can do to resolve issue with the bioretention basin and retaining walls creating separation from the street and affecting the pedestrian feel of the project. Site design, not site engineering right now.
- I like the idea of eliminating the brick and bringing the hardiboard all the way down.
- If you do something at that end elevation your stone will change.
- Look at the number of window types and proportions, including the end elevation oriented towards Tennyson Lane; too much variety. Look at the building to the left ("Community Center"), it seems to have less variety of window proportions than the other building ("Independent Living") and that contributes to its complexity and busyness.

ACTION:

On a motion by DeChant, seconded by Slayton, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-0) with address of comments made during discussion.

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 rating for this project is 5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1902 Tennyson Lane

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

5

**CITY OF MADISON
INTERDEPARTMENTAL
CORRESPONDENCE**

Date: July 7, 2014

To: Plan Commission
From: Patrick Anderson, Assistant Zoning Administrator
Subject: 1910 Tennyson Lane

Present Zoning District: PD-GDP

Proposed Zoning District: PD-SIP

Proposed Use: Construct multi-family dwelling with 70 independent units and 60 assisted living units

MAJOR OR NON-STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS (Comments which are special to the project and/or may require additional work beyond a standard, more routine project).

GENERAL OR STANDARD REVIEW COMMENTS

1. Provide a minimum bicycle parking spaces for each building distributed as both *Short Term* and *Long Term* bicycle parking, as required per sec. 28.141(4) and 28.141(11). Provide a detail of the bike rack design including any wall mounts. NOTE: current code requires a maximum of 25% of the bicycle parking spaces may be structured bicycle parking (wall-mount or stacked). Call out and dimension required stalls as well as access aisle on the final plan. NOTE: A bicycle-parking stall is two feet by six feet with a five-foot access area.
A bicycle parking reduction may be requested with this project, but has not been specifically requested with this submittal.

ZONING CRITERIA

Bulk Requirements	Required	Proposed
Lot Area	As per approved plans	As per submitted plans
Lot width	As per approved plans	As per submitted plans
Usable open space	As per approved plans	As per submitted plans
Front yard	As per approved plans	As per submitted plans
Side yards	As per approved plans	As per submitted plans
Rear yard	As per approved plans	As per submitted plans
Floor area ratio	As per approved plans	As per submitted plans
Building height	As per approved plans	As per submitted plans

1910 Tennyson Lane

July 7, 2014

Page 2

Site Design	Required	Proposed
Number parking stalls	As per approved plans	As per submitted plans
Accessible stalls	As per approved plans	As per submitted plans
Loading	As per approved plans	To be shown on final plans
Number bike parking stalls	1 per unit m; (75) 1 guest space per 10 units short term minimum for residential guests shall be within 100' of principal entrance. (7) Assisted living: 1 per 4 units (15) + 1 per 5 employees: (30) = (6) <u>Total - 103</u>	TBD (1) Guest stalls -6 Employee – stalls - 6 Short - 1- guest 75 - independent living 15 – assisted living
Landscaping	As Per approved plans	As per submitted plans
Lighting	Yes	Yes

Other Critical Zoning Items	
Urban Design	Yes (PD)
Floodplain	No
Adjacent to park	No
Barrier free (ILHR 69)	Yes
Utility easements	Yes

With the above conditions, the proposed project **does** comply with all of the above requirements.