

AGENDA # 5

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	PRESENTED: March 16, 2011
TITLE: 677 South Segoe Road – PUD(GDP-SIP) for a Residential Building with 64 Apartments. 20 th Ald. Dist. (19952)	REFERRED: REREFERRED: REPORTED BACK:
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	ADOPTED: POF:
DATED: March 16, 2011	ID NUMBER:

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Mark Smith, Dawn O’Kroley, Richard Slayton, John Harrington, R. Richard Wagner, and Jay Handy.

Slayton recused himself from this item.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of March 16, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a residential PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 677 South Segoe Road. Appearing on behalf of the project were John Bieno, representing TJK Design Build; Denise Lamb, representing the Midvale Heights Community Association. Bieno reviewed the project for a mixed-use development with 77 units, underground and surface parking. At the noted meetings and conversations with the neighborhood, and that the project as presented now is a culmination of all these inputs. The project now consists of two buildings, the commercial space has been removed, there are 64-units included in the project, and working with the neighborhood needs and the ownership group, the building starts at 3-stories at the corner of Odana and Segoe Roads and steps up to four stories, the drive aisle between the two buildings is not gone and replaced as a pedestrian link, the building further to the east is a 4-story that steps back down to 3-stories as it gets closer to the neighborhood itself. They have minimized much of the surface parking to create a buffer space between the single-family residences. They intend to berm the upper landscape so any lighting will be softened from the neighborhood. They have created a pedestrian link with a connector directly adjacent to the bus stop that goes to a community room on the lower level. The material palette has been simplified to block, cedar siding and stucco at the entries, and colors changed to give the building itself some definition.

Denise Lamb read a letter to the Commission from the Midvale Heights Community Association, stating they have declined to support this proposed development given the development’s lack of conformity with the Midvale Heights-Westmorland Neighborhood Plan in terms of height and density of the buildings. Changes to the site plan have been made to address some neighborhood concerns but they feel it is not enough, particularly at the southwest end. Neighbors have asked for a traffic study.

Comments and questions from the Commission were as follows:

- The corner and the parking itself needs to be more integrated to the landscaping.

- We need to see a larger context site drawing that shows the single-family homes to the south and the adjacent properties to the east.
- My biggest concern is density. I don't know that I quite understand how this fits into the neighborhood plan and context.
- I'm not certain a change from mixed-use development to all residential development fits in with the plan for this area.
 - We are having a big box proposed here. We have over 200,000 square feet of retail across the street. We look at this as more of a regional basis; we didn't want to compete with the corporate side of the street. Retail/commercial could have sat empty for a very long time. Removing that makes the project more financially attainable.
- The west face is your entry and the landscaped area is your front porch. The main entrance to the building should relate to that west face. Consider relocating that stair with a westerly entry that relates to the community space and shift Segoe entry to a unit entry.
- Need to have more depth to the Segoe façade.
- I'd like to see you work some of these density and other issues out with the neighborhood before you come back.
- I'm not convinced that where you have your rain gardens is going to do much good.
 - Two are lower than the site adjacent to Odana Road. Another is piped off-site. Our engineer has since come back with some other options.

When you return show us exactly how these stormwater management issues are going to be dealt with; including roof.

- Provide information on relationship of units to bedrooms, parking stalls, etc.
- Look at conflict between garage entry and surface parking lot.
- Look at use of previous pavers.
- Provide information on existing property of comparable range.
- I think some of these areas could really be detailed better with more landscaping.
- Area at corner and between building could have more; beef-up landscaping to be more aesthetically pleasing with options for non-lawn plantings especially at the south edge of the parking lot.
- I think you would do well to make some sort of connection from the walk between buildings and to the parking lot.
- Place specimen canopy trees at parking lot's southeast edge.
- I don't have an issue with the mass. The context is probably ¼ the size of this. From a massing standpoint, I don't think it would be noticed at all.

ACTION:

On a motion by Smith, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0). The motion provided for address of the above and the following:

- A larger context site drawing that shows the single-family homes to the south and the adjacent properties to the east.

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 6.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 677 South Segoe Road

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

General Comments:

- Need a grand gesture at corner of Segoe and Odana. More context to understand how/if proposal fits into adopted plans and Comprehensive Plan. Study garage/driveway conflicts. Like architecture.
- Façades appear to be unsolved Rubik’s Cube, and why three different hats on building?
- Need stronger landscape ties and blending; stormwater needs greater planning. Density?