

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION	<b>PRESENTED:</b> June 20, 2007
TITLE: 1500 Block of Burningwood Way – PUD(GDP-SIP) for Three Duplex Buildings. 18 <sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist. (06226)	<b>REFERRED:</b> <b>REREFERRED:</b> <b>REPORTED BACK:</b>
AUTHOR: Alan J. Martin, Secretary	<b>ADOPTED:</b> <b>POF:</b>
DATED: June 20, 2007	<b>ID NUMBER:</b>

---

Members present were: Paul Wagner, Chair; Lou Host-Jablonski, Marsha Rummel, Todd Barnett, Bruce Woods, Michael Barrett and Richard Slayton.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of June 20, 2007, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** consideration of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located in the 1500 Block of Burningwood Way. Appearing on behalf of the project were Craig Makela and Dan Murray. Appearing in opposition to the project was Janet Battista. Appearing neither in support nor opposition was Jon Becker. Revised plans as presented feature the following:

- Combined paired drives for each of the duplex buildings into a single twelve foot wide concrete drive, incorporating 6 feet of crushed granite on both sides of the drive to provide a pervious area as an alternate to porous paving.
- The location of the three duplex structures as relate to the main access drive/fire lane have been modified to create a sweep.
- The quoins at the corners of the building have been removed.
- Enhanced window details and examples were provided that parallel those with the plans, elevations and perspective renderings.
- The previous long roofline of the building has been eliminated with a step-in height in the slope of the first-story element along the additional chimneys to add visual scale.
- Following the presentation, Janet Battista and Jon Becker representing friends of the Cherokee Marsh raised concerns with the environmental aesthetics the development which included issue with runoff basin into adjacent wetlands, the large buildings having no relationship between wetlands and the environment. The need for screening the development from adjacent wetlands and lake (river) in addition to further issues distributed within a correspondence to the Commission. It was noted that the developers should meet a higher standard than the minimum, with traffic concerns noted relevant to daily trips per day, issue of water usage, solar orientation, as well as the need to use more porous pavement on access lane.

Following the presentation and testimony the Commission noted the following:

- Provide more extensive rain gardens on the site, still not comfortable with building, a mix of different styles and roof treatment. Differences in perspective rendering vs. the elevations in the packet were noted; a hodgepodge of elements.
- “The landscape plan notes the use of Chinese and fountain grass; they are invasive.
- The plan should utilize “native plantings,” not natural.
- Need to identify landscaping specifically on the landscape plan.
- Use swamp white oak as well as to check all species to be “native” utilizing the City Engineer’s website for compatible plants for stormwater detention and rain gardens.
- Need to adopt whole maintenance approach to provide for native plantings that need to be provided, need outline.
- Eliminate Ash, due to oncoming disease issue.
- Relevant to infiltration, eliminate or reduce the amount of Bluegrass for better infiltration and lower maintenance.
- Provide layers for alternatives for storm water infiltration onsite, such as more rain gardens spread around, more conservation plantings including more screening. Provide more levels of infiltration starting at higher elevations of the site as well as need to provide for night sky complaint, neighborhood-friendly lighting.
- Construct filtration areas on upper elevations of the slope before the road to deal with stormwater infiltration as well as incorporate native plantings.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Rummel, seconded by Woods, the Urban Design Commission **REFERRED** this item. The motion was passed on a vote of (6-0-1) with Wagner abstaining. The referral motion required address of the above stated concerns.

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 4, 4, 4.5, 5, 5 and 5.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 1500 Block Burningwood Way**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	3	5	2	-	-	5	-	4
	5	6	4/5	-	-	6	-	5
	-	4	5.5	-	-	-	-	5
	5	5	4	-	-	-	4	4.5
	4	4	3	5	-	5	3	4
	5	4	4	6	-	6	5	5

**General Comments:**

- Landscape needs a lot of help with natives and stormwater retention before the retention pond.
- Architecture still needs work – building is too “high shouldered” looking (at least on the rendering as presented). It needs slightly lower roof slopes, shorter distance above window levels, bigger overhangs, and more landscaping.
- Reduce/eliminate turf, add water gardens at higher grades. Plan list must have native plantings, including trees and screening buffers.
- Needs true conservation plantings throughout. Once again very average architecture on a premium site.
- Architecture and on-site stormwater detention.