

AGENDA # 4

City of Madison, Wisconsin

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION **PRESENTED:** February 7, 2007

TITLE: 733 C.T.H. "M" – PUD-GDP for 74
Residential Units. 9th Ald. Dist. (05443) **REFERRED:**
REREFERRED:
REPORTED BACK:

AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary **ADOPTED:** **POF:**

DATED: February 7, 2007 **ID NUMBER:**

Members present were: Lou Host-Jablonski, Acting Chair; Lisa Geer, Robert March, Bruce Woods, Cathleen Feland, Ald. Noel Radomski, Todd Barnett and Michael Barrett.

SUMMARY:

At its meeting of February 7, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD-GDP for 74 residential units located at 733 C.T.H. "M." Appearing on behalf of the project was Matthew Aro. Aro presented contextual information on the site relative to surrounding properties, including an array of photos, as well as aerials. A detailed review of site sections provided information as to the relationship of the proposed building pads for the four structures as they relate to the topography of the site. It was noted that the buildings will sit on a ridge. Aro distributed a tree survey detailing the location of existing trees on the site which emphasized trees at 12-inches or more in diameter. The survey noted the extensive amount of burr oaks and black locust parallel to the site's road frontage, as well as a invasive brush and tree species. It was noted that existing red oak, cottonwood, cherry and black locust in the vicinity of the site were not well maintained, featuring root damage due to previous quarry activity. Aro then provided a review of the building footprint details, including proposed lower level parking. Following the presentation, the Commission noted the following:

- The group of burr oaks (northerly) important to save. Could be utilized to screen parking lot access.
- Save trees along the easterly boundary of the site with consideration for relocating or moving parking and drive aisle access. Try to save as much as possible but difficult to analyze without a grading plan. In addition, the building locations may need to be tweaked in order to provide for preservation of trees.
- Issue with the potential of the clearing of trees to create more open space, to what extent; don't want to compromise what is natural to site, provide more information.
- The plans as submitted lack adequate information relevant to property size and dimensions, proposed setbacks, including basic road dimensions.
- It appears that the building footprints and location are not modified to recognize the existence and preservation of trees; not all trees specimen but may give value to the property; modify plan to suit with consideration for preservation of the burr oaks within the drive aisle and parking area on northerly portions of the site.
- The sidewalk at the base of the building still not well thought out, relationship between middle two buildings needs to be re-examined.

- Look at narrowing driveways and drive aisles in consultation with the Fire Department. In addition, examine sprinkling to provide an option to reduce the width of the drive aisles that will also be utilized for fire access.
- Look at the use of a mountable curve to reduce the drive aisle width.
- Need to look at better placement of the buildings to provide a relationship between structures with additional landscaping and other amenities.
- The rationale to not being able to move buildings to the west due to the now defunct quarry; requires more attention to provide options for building location.
- Look at alternative layout of surface parking to save trees along the easterly boundary of the site and between middle buildings.
- Great utilization of underground parking, like overall layout.
- Last three buildings on the site crammed together to get more buildings on site, too much for site need more space in between whether you lose one, make buildings smaller or relocate.
- A long-term management plan needed for removal of invasive species; need to get right species going, need to be replaced with desirable species to get rid of invasive species.
- Need to understand how buildings relate to site improvements.
- Need to know how east elevation is handled. Question windows versus blank wall, its relationship to the adjoining property especially the close proximity of the buildings and driveway access.
- The development represents a long cul-de-sac, no way to access site without a car, no grid of streets to provide connections from the site to the adjacent area and area as a whole, not a developable site for that reason.
- The placement of sidewalks directly abutting the face of buildings and drive aisle needs further study.
- Like density of the project if existing large trees can be maintained.

ACTION:

On a motion by Geer, seconded by March, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-2-1) with Feland and Barrett voting no and Ald. Radomski abstaining. The motion to refer required address of the previously stated concerns with the prior review of the project, the above stated comments and the following:

- Want to see a general tweaking of building placement looking at the mass of buildings and their location to better fit site, in combination with the preservation of trees.

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, 4.5, 6, 6 and 7.5.

URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 733 County Road M

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
Member Ratings	4	5	-	-	-	4	5	4.5
	2	-	4	4	-	1	1	3
	6	-	-	-	-	6	5	6
	1	-	-	-	-	2	2	-
	8	-	-	-	-	7	7	7.5
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6

General Comments:

- Appreciate the arborist evaluation of the site trees. It would merit working around the two burr oak clusters and the nice hackberry to preserve the nature quality of the site and to frame the buildings, soften the walking trails to follow the hills’ contours. May also be able to save the 24” bur oak at the top of the drive by slightly flattening the drive at this point.
- This is a cul-de-sac – the root of all traffic problems on major arterials like CTH M and Mineral Point Road. It is also a patently anti-urban development pattern. Given that it is cut off from local streets (for ped-bike accessibility) it is undevelopable. What are the planned linkages to surrounding developments, if any?
- Difficult site. Would like to see substantial trees retained.
- Too much for small site.
- Need more information: why is this suitable for housing – aren’t other uses more appropriate? Does the City support this use? Buildings to suit site. Now cookie cutter.
- Good start on a difficult site.
- Site is somewhat too dense, in my opinion. Appreciate the comprehensive tree report.