

## AGENDA # 7

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> November 21, 2007
TITLE: 5101 Unity Place, Lot 1, Liberty Place, Planned Residential Development (P.R.D.), Eleven Duplex Structures. 16 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (08185)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: November 21, 2007	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Chair; John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Richard Wagner, Bonnie Cosgrove, Jay Ferm, Marsha Rummel and Todd Barnett.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of November 21, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **RECEIVED AN INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION** for a P.R.D. located at 5101 Unity Place. The project provides for the development of 11 duplex buildings utilizing a shared private drive on a single lot. According to introductory statements by Jane Shaefer (who spoke in favor of the project) the project was intended to be developed as a PUD(GDP-SIP). Shaefer, in conjunction with Steve Shulfer, architect provided further detailing on the proposed residential development, including the following:

- Building combination ranch style two-bedroom and bath and townhouse style, 3-bedroom with 2 ½ baths, and range from 1,021 square feet to 1,643 square feet in size.
- Buildings will feature asphalt roof shingles, vinyl clad windows, vinyl siding, vinyl accent boards, in combination with cultured stone.
- Each unit will have an attached 2-car garage, with trash collection by private contract.
- The arrangement of units orients all garage side access to the internal shared drive with street side façade featuring a “front door like appearance” with the provision of ground floor patios and entry doors.

Following the presentation staff noted to the Commission that the application as submitted noted requested approval as new construction within an Urban Design District (of which it's not), development as a PUD under a PUD zoning where it had been staff's perception; based on preapplication conferences with the Zoning Administrator, that the property would develop under its existing R4 zoning as a Planned Residential Development (P.R.D.), which is multi-family development on the lot where all bulk requirements of its zoning are met in regards to building setback, parking, yard requirements, building height and other elements. Based on the presentation and the general provisions of the project fitting all known bulk requirements of its underlying zoning, it is staff's belief that its consideration as a PUD is not necessary as reflected and noted on the Commission's agenda. Staff requested that the applicant further investigate the need for PUD zoning versus Planned Residential Development zoning under its existing zoning designation prior to any further consideration by the Commission. Following the presentation the Commission noted the following:

- One too many units on the site.
- Look at a more direct geometry to locate units on site with common open space in more of an urban fashion.
- Discrepancies between unit type and locations on plans need to be resolved.
- Make a commitment that driveways are a place to be parked on or not. If not, increase the amount of green open space on garage side elevations.
- Provide context on existing and proposed adjacent development.
- Deal with relationship of houses to the street more effectively.
- Relocate rain garden to alternate area to be enjoyed by others collectively.
- Resolve view of garages from interior drive.
- Provide more shared greenspace between the southerly tier of units.
- Turn buildings 90 degrees to create parking courts and create small private greenspace between buildings, along with associating them with entries and make usable for adjacent units.
- Look at integrating entries as main architectural element on garage side elevations.
- Too many buildings and problem with the way they are spread out; provide an additional rain garden.
- Make front door porches more usable with greater depth with a showy front door.
- Limit garage doors with consideration for concentrating garage parking to one portion of the site.
- Make landscape plan planting list more legible as well as the overall plan.

**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 1, 4, 6, 6, 6 and 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 5101 Unity Place**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	6	8	6	-	-	5	5	6
	5	6	6	-	-	5	6	6
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	6	6	6	-	-	5	7	6

General Comments:

- The site plan needs to be substantially reconceived. Difficult, two-sided site, but this proposal has too many buildings with too many garage doors.
- Too many buildings on one lot.
- I like the project, but think it is slightly too large for the space. It's a good looking building.
- Outstanding graphic presentation. Really aids our understanding.
- Great potential. Some issues to resolve but nothing that can't be dealt with.